

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1386883



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA



BS
476
565

CRITIQUE ON HIGHER CRITICISM

BY GEO. T. SMITH

WINFIELD, KANSAS
INDUSTRIAL FREE PRESS
1900

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

TO MY HIGHEST CRITIC:
MY WIFE

A4069

PREFACE.

This book grew. It is an attempt to avoid extremes. An invitation to prepare a paper for a Preachers' Association on this topic led to deeper study. The Right was inclined to stamp higher criticism "infidelity" and to surrender a most valuable method of study to unbelief. So far as the higher criticism is merely destructive, it is of no value to the student. Such a criticism can never be met by denunciation, but only by a more scientific and constructive criticism. So far as the new view is reasonable in its postulates, scientific and historical in its methods, it will command the twentieth century. So far as it predicates what cannot be proved, and is unhistorical and unscientific in its investigation, no depth of scholarship or wealth of language can save it from the theological museum.

The Left despised the fears of broader scholarship, or of the revision of theories hoary with the age. There seemed to be a delight in an iconoclasm which rushed to grasp the New. Sometimes more strength is required to stand than to run. An acknowledgment that neither we, nor our fathers, have discovered all, lies at the threshold of humility which is the door to knowledge. The admission that the past centuries have mined imperishable facts, and have inculcated eternal principles, is the prompt gratitude of every true student.

Eighteen years have passed since the writer read his first book along this line. That was the charming Lectures of W. Robertson Smith. For three years he has made this his study. To many genial authors on both sides he is indebted for the material for these pages.

Whether the writer be pronounced radical or conservative is of small moment compared with the fact that all who read these lines are controlled by a supreme desire to serve Christ, whose we are and whom we serve. May his favor be ours.

Winfield, Kansas, August, 1900.

CONTENTS.

- CHAPTER I: Definition and purpose
- CHAPTER II: Some beneficent work—The higher criticism of Homer and Cicero—The Apostles' Creed, Apostolic Constitutions, Apostolic Canon—Work on the New Testament: Marcion, books rejected—The modern attack on John—The Apochrypha
- CHAPTER III: The Psalms—The three-fold division of the Old Testament—The book of the heart—Esteemed by the early Church—Value to men to-day—Non-Davidic psalms—Proverbs—The poetry of the wisdom literature—Analysis—Ecclesiastes—Peculiarities—Is it pessimistic?—Was the author Solomon?—George Eliot, the modern Ecclesiastes—Job—The problem of sorrow—The arguments and solution—The prophets—Modern view—Prophets as statesmen as well as religious teachers—The prophets considered in chronological order—Was there a Deutero-Isaiah?
- CHAPTER IV: History of the theories of the origin of the Pentateuch—Traditional theory—Documentary—Fragmentary—Supplementary—Crystallization—Development—The French theory—Development theory stated.
- CHAPTER V: The argument from Deuteronomy—Dr Briggs's statement—Dr Driver's reasoning—References in later books—Was the book a deception—The positive argument
- CHAPTER VI: The argument from history—Solidity of this argument—Reference to preceding books—Disparagement of the history—Hosea's testimony—Joshua early—Silence and non-observance of law.

- CHAPTER VII: The argument from archæology—A new Old Testament—The method, results—Confirmation of the history—Names as fossils—Elaborate ceremonial in early days
- CHAPTER VIII: The argument from science—Definition—The fear of science—Imperative in scholarly higher criticism—Axioms—Test of the theories by the axioms
- CHAPTER IX: The argument from language and style—The logical method—The method of the New School—The test—The variant use of divine names—The vocabulary—Style and content—A mathematical demonstration—Tatian.
- CHAPTER X: The argument from ethics and religion—Was Deuteronomy a forgery?—Can the Scriptures be broken?—The attitude of Jesus.
- CHAPTER XI: The argument from the prophets and from prophecy—The law referred to by the prophets—Prophecy as a miracle—Bearing on the development theory.
- CHAPTER XII: The argument from psychology—Philosophy the seed-bed of difficulties—Hegelian evolution in the interpretation of the New Testament—Spencerian evolution in the criticism of the Old Testament—A spiral—Prepossessions—One sample professor's chair
- CHAPTER XIII: The argument from art—Legitimacy of the criterion—The True, the Good, the Beautiful.
- CHAPTER XIV: Daniel in the den of critics—Different views of critics—The arguments for a late date, historic, linguistic, and theological—The traditional argument—The tablets—The right of possession—The exactness of the history—The seventy weeks—The testimony of the Maccabees, also of the angel Gabriel
- CHAPTER XV: The obituary—Germany, a thought-nation; America, a deed-nation—When Beecher quit boring—The death of a false theory is the victory of the higher criticism—Causes of death—Lack of facts and other essentials—

CHAPTER XV: Complete proof of entrance into Nirvana—
The number of scholars on each side—Over
six hundred dead theories of the books of the
Bible since 1850—Dangers analyzed.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A—Reference to Deuteronomy in the prophets.

NOTE B—Forty-one distinctive phrases of Deuteronomy:
twenty peculiar to H.

NOTE C—Names as fossils.

NOTE D—Fifty words peculiar to P; the style of the writers.

NOTE E—Dr. Briggs's thirty Hebrew words.

NOTE F—Some biblical theology brought to grief.

NOTE H—The law in the prophets.

NOTE I—The retreat of modern scholarship.

NOTE K—Hebrew words peculiar to the Hexateuch. [The
Hebrew font had no final ם and but one form for װ.]

ABBREVIATIONS.

D.—The supposed writer of the book of Deuteronomy.

Dt. or Deut.—Deuteronomy.

E.—The supposed writer of certain portions of the Hexateuch
who preferred to use "Elohim" to designate the Divine
Being.

J.—The writer who preferred "Jehovah".

H.—The presumed writer of Lev. 17 to 26. This is called the
"Law of Holiness".

P.—The writer who lived in Babylon who was of the priestly
tribe.

JE.—A combination of J and E, or the 320 verses which are
either J or E.

R.—Redactor. He is supposed to have changed the text in
places.

"The theory" signifies the development theory. The "new
school", or "the critic", is used to designate the advocates of the
advanced view.

CHAPTER I.

DEFINITION AND PURPOSE.

Lower and Higher Criticism.

Criticism means judging. The Greek judge was "the critic". Lower criticism judges the text; higher criticism judges the book. Criticism is applied to all ancient literature; in some measure to modern writings also. The lower criticism endeavors to purify the text of an ancient writer; the higher criticism aims at an answer to questions concerning the entire and completed work. It is not independent of the text, nor of interpretation of the text. Instances will be met where the modern critic has felt obliged to contradict the words of an ancient writer. Sometimes he is sustained. In criticism of the ordinary historian he is frequently victorious. In criticism of the sacred writings, candor compels the admission that in some cases the critic has the weight of the testimony. In such instances, the defender of the inspiration of the writers of the Bible, must modify his theory of what inspiration did for the man. He is obliged to admit that it did not enter into the divine plan to inspire every copyist, every type-setter, every proof-reader till the end of time. In fact, none of them were infallible. We subjoin some definitions of the higher criticism by competent scholars:

Defined.

"The higher criticism is but a name for higher scholarship, scientifically used. If the Scriptures are fit subjects for scholarship, then the more scientific the scholarship, the greater its use in the field of Scripture."—*Dr. Fairbairn.*

"Biblical, literary criticism tests, by internal evidence, the

truth as to biblical statements concerning the authority and contents of the several books of the Bible."—*Principal Alfred Cave.*

"Higher criticism, sometimes called literary or historical criticism, seeks to understand the circumstances of time, place, author, reader, subject, etc., which occasioned the writing of the books of the Bible."—*Prof. B. C. DeWeese.*

"The higher criticism is not a body of conclusions nor a system of opinions regarding the Scriptures, but rather a habit of mind or a mode of handling them."—*Dr. B. A. Hinsdale.*

Thus defined by English and American scholars, there is nothing in the higher criticism to arouse antipathy or fear. As a method of study, it is not the possession of the Evil One. True, his children may use it as they have used every science, in its crude state, as a weapon against Christianity. Timid Christians have aided them by denouncing the new science as a foe to revealed religion. Astronomy, geology and biology have been dreaded by the friends of revelation and cherished by its enemies as supposed obstacles to the advance of the gospel.

The Newtonian theory of gravitation was opposed by some English writers because it was supported by Voltaire. Calvin read in the poetry of King David: "He hath made the round world so fast that it can not be moved," and triumphantly asked, "Who will offer to place the authority of Copernicus above that of the Holy Spirit?" Wesley indorsed this position. He also said: "Infidels know, if Christians do not, that to give up belief in witchcraft is to give up the Bible." Gaussen, defending verbal inspiration, held that the Bible is perfect authority on scientific subjects. A recent writer hastily says that to accept the theory of evolution, in explaining the religion and books of the Bible, is to surrender the citadel of faith and to desert to the enemy. Jesus does not seem to have shared that fear. "First the blade, then the ear", etc., is evolution. Every science thus abused has afterward added immensely to our knowledge of God. "No indebtedness of religion outside its own immediate agencies will at all equal that which it is incurring, and is to incur, to science. It is borne upward with moral buoyancy and irresistible energy by this deep-seated spirit of inquiry."—*President Bascom.*

The gain accrued is by the deeper study which dispels doubt. Progress is in zigzag lines. The radical would move straight forward with reckless and ruinous speed. The conservative, in retaining the good, sometimes carries the dead. The resultant is advance along a diagonal.

**Growth Means
Change.**

Death is the price of life. That anything may live, something must die. Whatever lives, grows. Whatever grows, changes. There is no advance without such change. Doubt is the forerunner of firmer, more intelligent faith. The shaking of the tree loosens the roots, sends them further down, and produces better fruitage.

The giving of a revelation does not preclude growth from generation to generation. Ideas can not be lifted bodily from one mind to another. From the speaker to the hearer no ideas pass. There are vibrations of air which strike the ear-drum and cause Corti's harp to tremble. The mind creates the idea suggested by a material cause. Even a revealed truth can be conveyed only to a mind prepared. To regard religion as a series of revealed statements thrown down for men regardless of their mental preparedness, is to deny evolution, but it makes religion, like a shell imbedded in the Maria Theresa, an excrescence. No consistent, reasonable faith coheres to such an idea, no rational worship is possible. Evolution is in the divine plan. God is limited in giving revelation by the ability of man to receive.

**Extremes Beget
Doubt.**

There is a human factor in revelation which tinges revelation itself. The skeptic magnifies the earth-born element till it covers all. He accounts for everything without God. He destroys revelation. The extreme conservative minimizes the human factor and declares that a mistake in the Bible is a mistake of God. Nothing pleases the opposer of the truth better than such an assertion.

A conservative writer says he has known hundreds of men made infidels by the higher criticism. We challenge the statement. An erroneous theory of inspiration has doubtless been an important factor. Earnest Renan is the typical case. He was a believer. He thought that unless he could defend the

theory of verbal inspiration, he must give up the faith. That wrecked him. In 228 New Testament quotations from the Old Testament, only fifty-three agree with the Hebrew. The New Testament writers and speakers prefer the Septuagint, yet in seventy-six instances where the Hebrew and Septuagint agree, the New Testament boldly differs from both. In ninety-nine quotations, all three are at variance.

The Bible claims a verbal inspiration for a very **Man Must Reason.** limited portion of its contents. The objector may ask, "Is not the Bible an infallible guide?"

It is not so declared. "Then every one must judge what part is uninspired and false?" True. He can not read three chapters till he comes to a statement by Satan, half false and half true. Man has always longed for an infallible guide. The Greek sought the Delphic oracle, the Roman pored over the Sybilline books. The Roman church makes itself infallible and releases its votaries from hard thinking, while the Protestant declared the Bible infallible. Alas for the claim! How could God make a book infallible? There are two good reasons why God has not met this universal desire for an infallible oracle. A book can not be inspired. Jesus breathed on the apostles and gave them the Holy Spirit. Later they received such overwhelming power that they are said to have been immersed in the Spirit. Yet they were not infallible. Not in conduct. "Peter was to be blamed." Not in knowledge. The first Congress of Preachers debated, as we do, then laid restrictions on the Gentiles which are alien to the genius of Christianity, and which would have hampered its growth if Paul had not amended them.

The other reason is: God compels men to think. **No Infallible Guide.** Rome allows no thinking outside the grooves, and Rome produces no leaders. She is being constantly pushed to the rear. Reason is a spark of divinity. It underlies and supports the moral faculty. In that we are partakers of the divine nature. Violence to reason debases man and dishonors God. "Thoughts," said Luther, "are toll-free." "A doctrine of inspiration," says President Bascom, "that in any way bears down the reason, the moral insight, is immoral." A surer plan to weaken man, to check his growth into strength,

wisdom and divinity than the gift of an infallible guide, could not be devised. Tripped by our mistakes, we stumble through our tears, onward to clearer light and a victorious manhood. God does not save His people from error.

In the debate with Bishop Purcell, [Bishop Campbell] said: "In strict propriety there is no infallible rule of faith. Nor is it possible there can be; for men and angels have erred under all rules. I wish to be understood, the terms *fallible* and *infallible* do not at all apply to *things*. They only apply to *persons*. We have a perfect, or complete, or sufficient rule; but we can not have an infallible one. The fallibility or infallibility is in the application of the rule—not in the rule itself. . . . As Paul said on an occasion not exactly similar, we may here say, 'If there could have been a law given to free agents which would have precluded error, verily God would have given it.' . . . We have a perfect rule and if we apply it perfectly it will make us perfect."

The truth, like gold, must be mined. Before America was colonized, a ship carried a load of iron pyrites from North Carolina to England, believing it to be gold. So men come with "fool's gold" for the truth even now. They are to be met, not as by Carpzov, with a theory of mechanical inspiration, nor by denunciation, but by deeper and more scientific investigation. In the field under discussion, this is pre-eminently the glory of the higher criticism. It will vindicate itself as the handmaid of the truth.

The words of Pastor Robinson, as the Mayflower sailed from Delfshaven, are perennially true: "God hath yet much truth to break forth from His Word." The nineteenth century closes with a vastly improved vision of God compared with the eighteenth. The next century should make longer strides. Still, in seeking treasures of truth, sincere men will zealously guard iron pyrites. They will strive to make error current. Put that mineral on a shovel over a fire, it vanishes into sulphur and smoke. The fascination of being an advanced thinker, the magnetic influence of a favorite teacher and the pride of an iconoclast may lead men into error. Their theories ought to be courteously treated. Or, rather, the theory should be mercilessly scathed, while the adherent is held in high esteem. Only by a better, because more accurate and more scholarly, higher criticism can

being in
an H. C. T.
C. S.

such erroneous conclusions be brought to their death. The history of the lower criticism of the New Testament is an analogy and a prophecy.

**Courage Brings
Victory.**

Erasmus printed the first copy of the Greek New Testament in 1516. Cardinal Ximenes, Robert Stephens and Theodore Beza followed.

The Greek manuscripts were not earlier than the tenth century, and were very defective. The text was not the same. The effort was made to correct the various readings, but they multiplied under examination, and zeal flagged. Timid Christians said it would shatter the faith of the people if it were known. Skeptics improved the opportunity. Dr. Mills spent his life in collecting ancient manuscripts and in collating early versions and quotations in apostolic fathers. He found 30,000 variations. Dr. Whitby assailed him for subverting the faith. Collins, in his "Discourse on Free Thinking", used the fact against Christianity. Some favored closing the door of investigation. But Bentley, the greatest Greek scholar of his day, effectually answered both Whitby and Collins. He showed that all ancient books have suffered in the same way. Longinus's "Treatise on the Sublime", almost the length of Mark, has 3000 various readings. Terence, smaller than the New Testament, with only a few copies coming down to us, has 20,000. There are 60,000 in Plato. Even in Shakespeare, from eight manuscripts only, two of which are early, there are 3700.

In 250 years, when Griesbach died, toward the end of the last century, the estimated number of variant readings was 150,000. Prof. Norton says: "Of the various readings of the New Testament nineteen-twentieths, at least, are to be dismissed at once, not on account of their intrinsic unimportance, but because they are found in so few authorities and their origin is so easily explained, that no critic would regard them as having any claim to be inserted in the text." The remaining twentieth are largely differences in spelling, in grammar and the use of synonyms. Nearly four hundred years of struggle leaves the Greek scholar with only a dozen passages in which the text is doubtful. In the Old Testament resources are limited. There are 10,000 various readings in 640 manuscripts.

No reason for fear of the higher criticism exists. If the

truth lies along these lines which sound destructive, follow fearlessly to the end. This is the surest way to lay bare the error. Abused, it brings forth death. Rightly used, it issues in the truth. Shall we flee from it as Moses from his rod? Seize it bravely, it becomes a wand to release men from bondage.

CHAPTER II.

SOME BENEFICENT WORK OF HIGHER CRITICISM.

**Homer, Cicero
and Plato.**

The higher criticism has been applied to all ancient literature. The contest over Homer was as fierce as that over Moses. Curtius held that "Homer" was a name given to an ideal patron of poets. Duntzee claimed that its meaning was "collector", hence Homer was the compiler of various poems which he wove into one. Sengebusch identified Homer with Thancyrus, the bard of Thrace. Wolf, in 1795, precipitated a theory which required the labors of nearly a century for its banishment. It is the theory now applied with greater complexity to the early books of the Bible. Wolf held that from internal evidence he could prove that the songs, which compose the Iliad and the Odyssey, were originally disconnected and were later put together by a redactor. The redactor was said to be Pisistratus. Each school of Homeric critics proved the others to be wrong. The Wolfian clan eliminated spurious verses and interpolations. The believers in the unity of the songs admitted that interpolations existed.

Gladstone's faith in the integrity of Homeric authorship never wavered. To the last he believed that the criticism of the Biblical books would likewise result in a larger and firmer faith.

Cicero and Plato passed through the same ordeal. At one time the four orations were denied to Cicero and given to his amanuensis. In ecclesiastical literature the higher criticism has saved us from many a sorrow. By it we know that the so-called Apostles' Creed is centuries younger than the apostles.

The Apostolical Constitutions are eight books, by which ecclesiastics endeavored to claim apostolical authority for the directions which they originated themselves.

The Apostolic Canon is a venerable body of rules which assert an apostolic origin. The Eastern church receives the entire 85; the Roman church accepts 50; the Protestants reject the whole lot. This is the power of freedom conferred by the higher criticism. All these incubi has it lifted.

**Good Work on
New Testament.** In the domain of the New Testament the greatest victories have been won. For every book we have in the New Testament, four others, seeking a place among the immortals, have been cast aside. At least sixty of these have carried their names into oblivion. Forty are known. Some have imposing titles. Several are gospels. Those of Paul; of Peter; of Thomas; of Mathias; of the Infancy; of the Egyptians; to the Hebrews, are gospels rejected. The Acts of Peter; the Acts of Paul; the Apocalypse of Paul are some enticing titles. Some died hard. Tatian, between 160 and 180 A. D., wrote a Diatessaron, that is, one gospel out of four, which was used in the Syrian churches till the fifth century. The Epistle of Barnabas was current till the twelfth century. It was buried by decree of Pope Gelasius II in 1118.

The Apocalypse of Peter was popular for a long time. It gave an account of events from the creation till the end of the world.

Clement, who is named by Paul in Phil. 4:3, being requested by the church in Corinth to help in some difficulty, wrote them an epistle from Rome. Said he, "Seek peace, shun envy and jealousy." It was quoted as Scripture, and is included in the Codex Alexandrinus.

The Apocalypse of Paul claimed to be revelations of his visions in heaven and hell. Higher criticism rejected these as uninspired and unworthy.

About the year 140, Marcion came from Asia Minor to Rome. He had a Luke's gospel with emendations, and ten of Paul's epistles. He said that Christianity had been corrupted, and blamed all the apostles, except Paul. He gained a number of followers. Tertullian challenged him to produce a copy of the inspired original gospel with historical attestations. Marcion

said that that was impossible, for it had been corrupted by the apostles. Tertullian said that this was to lay the blame on the Lord for choosing such apostles.

It was no short nor easy task for the higher criticism of that day. Jerome (b. 340, d. 420) says of Jude: "This epistle is rejected by most." The Shepherd of Hermas is found in the Codex Sinaiticus, and was called inspired by Ireneus and Origen.

**Reformers as
Higher Critics.**

The leaders of the Reformation were higher critics. Luther had a rule: "All books of the New Testament must have been written by an apostle or under his direction." This cut out Hebrews, and James. He also rejected 2d Peter, Jude, and Revelation as destitute of, or at least deficient in, historic proof. These books were all disputed as late as Origen's day (185-254).

Calvin excluded Revelation and 3d John from his commentary. He doubted 2d Peter.

The Revised Version of 1881 puts Acts 8:37 in the margin, and Mark 16:9-20 is separated by a space from the gospel of Mark. The story of the woman taken in adultery is separated by a space, and put into brackets; the story of the angel troubling the water is put in the margin; 1st John 5:7 is omitted entirely. In such cases the lower and the higher criticism overlap.

In 1820 Bretschneider opened the attack on John's gospel. The Tübingen school tried to keep alive his theory of the late origin of the gospel. Higher criticism alone could meet the attack.

In Germany, Neander, Tholuck, Bleek; in England, Liddon, Lightfoot, Westcott; in America, Norton, Abbott, Fisher, defended the Johannine origin with such depth of scholarship, and wealth of argument as to come near to a demonstration. Bretschneider candidly admitted that his position was indefensible.

The Tübingen school faced the alternative of admitting some epistles of Paul as genuine, or of an uphill struggle against a mountain of evidence. They avoided the struggle. But the concession, thus rendered necessary by the labor of the higher criticism, was sufficient to render nugatory the skillful arguments of that able and scholarly company.

**Old Testament
Apocrypha.**

The Old Testament also had its parasites. The collection is generally known as the Apocrypha, meaning "hidden", or "secret". They were read secretly, *i. e.*, not publicly, but at home. The Jew so carefully guarded the door of the canon, that Ezekiel was with difficulty admitted. Some Rabbis thought that he contradicted Moses. The beginning and end of that prophet were not to be read by the Jew till he was thirty. The Apocryphal books contain some history, but much that is superstition and fable. There is enough of history and gnomie wisdom to cause the LXX, the Vulgate and the Council of Hippo to count them in the canon of Holy Scripture. The Council of Trent reaffirmed this decision. The doctrine of purgatory receives support from the Apocrypha. Origin, and Clement of Alexandria called these books inspired. Till 1821 they were published in the Bible. Then a controversy arose which was practically higher criticism. From 1826 the Apocrypha was published by itself, marked off from the rest of the Old Testament. This was a victory for a reverent yet remorseless criticism. We have thus briefly noticed some of the results achieved by the higher criticism. All are beneficent. The ultimate decision of the questions now in the crucible will be for the truth.

Macaulay says that the impartial judge must concede that in the politics of England both the radical and the conservative have aided in the national advance. The radical invents, the conservative preserves. Either may err. Often the stiff obstinacy which resists any change, strangles reform and chokes the truth till it is lifeless; on the other hand, the radical has run after a dream. Macaulay tells of the wary Scotch growing wild over the West India scheme. Mackay describes the delirium of London over the Sea Bubble. That France should dance to George Law's Mississippi project is not as strange as the Tulip mania of Holland. O. P. Morton said of the Civil War: "It was the delirium of eight millions of people. It was madness." Nor are scholars exempt. There are instances where a school of thought has supposed that all men would accept their views, but they have died away with scarcely a reminiscence.

The translators of Bleek declared that there were twenty

schools of the higher critics. The traditional or conservative view does not afford data for such variety of opinion. Especially in the Pentateuchal criticism is it noticeable that the advanced school has numerous bands of congenial scholars, who differ from others in minor points, while the entire company separates from the conservative body.

Up to the Pentateuch the criticism is of a literary character. It rarely collides with any New Testament teaching. But the claim is made that the criticism of the new school in regard to the Pentateuch or the Hexateuch does seriously conflict with that of the New Covenant Scriptures. Fully as strenuously is that assertion denied. We shall best serve the cause if we treat some of the books of the Old Testament briefly, then take up the Pentateuchal question in detail.

It is necessary to group the schools in two great families as indicated—the conservative, and the radical. Thus individual scholars may be misrepresented. It is inevitable. The representative men are chosen but the generous student will remember that not every follower endorses all that the chief affirms.

CHAPTER III.

THE PSALMS AND THE PROPHETS.

The Psalms. The Teacher divided the Old Testament into the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. Whether that classification was at that time accepted by the Jews is in doubt. The historical and the prophetic books are thus thrown together, and the Psalms include the poetical and the wisdom literature.

The Psalms is the book of the heart; it is the ripe product of the Hebrew mind in that field where it was preeminent. The Greek was his superior in the search for the essence of things, in the subtle problems of philosophy; the Roman led in law and organization; but the religious nature of the Hebrew was intuitive and spontaneous. They bequeathed to the world the best manual of devotion; they voiced the language of the universal human heart in its deep longings for the Source of its being and of all good.

If the 90th Psalm be from Moses, (decisive reasons for rejecting that view have not been presented), then the Psalter links itself with the very foundations of the Theocracy. Our Lord observed the custom, at the passover, of singing at the beginning, Psalms 113 and 114, then at the close, 115 to 118. The early church eagerly adopted the Psalms. Thus they began their morning and evening devotions. During Passion week, the 22d was repeated every day. It was thought that Jesus repeated all of this Psalm on the cross.

Paul directed the singing of a Psalm in worship. James, also, in times of rejoicing. Jerome says they were sung continuously in the fields and vineyards in Palestine toward the

close of the fifth century. According to Jeremy Taylor, the primitive church would advance no one to the higher orders of the ministry unless he could repeat the Psalter by heart. We may quote two sayings of the fathers; first Ambrose, in the fourth century: "Although all Divine Scripture breathes the grace of God, yet sweet beyond all others is the book of Psalms. History instructs, the law teaches, prophecy announces, rebuke chastens, morality persuades; in the book of Psalms we have the fruit of all these and a kind of medicine for the salvation of man." Then Athanasius: "To me it seems that the Psalms are to him who sings them as a mirror wherein he may see himself and the motions of his soul, and with like feelings utter them."

Other parts of Scripture direct our faith and our obedience; the Psalms give voice to emotions and feelings too deep for utterance. The young man who was seeking the way of forgiveness and who was told by the preacher to read the Psalms through on his knees, and perhaps he would find peace, needed Priscilla. As a prodigal and penitent he would find the feeling of his soul breathed forth in words that deepen contrition; as a hart panting for the water brooks, so his soul would thirst for God. But the beautiful language of emotion does not take the place of law or prophet.

Twenty thousand is the estimated number of hymns and songs which have found their way into the hymn books of Christendom; yet none of these equal the pearls among the Psalms. In the majesty of conception, in sweetness of diction, in accuracy of the expression of the profoundest emotion, the Hebrew Psalmist leads all others. Every worshiper is helped by an earnest reading of these lyrics. They enkindle the flame of worship, arouse a greater fervency and a more consuming zeal than a monotonous and easily satisfied faith naturally yields. Without such incentives the Christian life tends to sink to a dull conformity to the low ideals of the world.

A classification of the Psalms may take one of several bases. First as to number, there are five books. The first has forty-one psalms; the second has thirty-one; the third and the fourth, seventeen each; the fifth, forty-one. There is a notable difference in the choice of the divine names, viz, Elohim, or Jehovah, in the different books. Another division is based on the use, From 120 to 134 are Songs of Degrees or of Ascent. They were

sung by the Israelite as he journeyed to Jerusalem to attend the three annual feasts. There were the Passover hymns, the penitential psalms (seven in number), which were recited one each day when lent was instituted. There are the hallelujah (praise to God), the alphabetic, and the imprecatory psalms. These last plant their defense on being national, not individual, aspirations, and as wishing the salvation of the wicked, believing that only divine punishment can bring reformation.

The division by authors groups the critics. Seventy-three are ascribed to David. Today a composer of a half dozen songs has sufficient stock to arrange a song book and call it his. From an early date the Psalms were spoken of as the Book of David. His deep religious nature, his varied experience as a shepherd, a soldier, a fugitive, a refugee in the enemy's country, a king, an exile, a reformer of the national worship, admirably fitted him for the work which all external testimony assigns to him, as the writer of these psalms. They are true to life and to the experience of men in every century. A subdivision, which is not positive, places fourteen before his accession to the throne, nineteen to the prosperous years of his reign, ten to the time following his great sin and his flight from Absalom, ten to the period of his exile, and three or four to the closing years of his reign.

To Asaph are given twelve, to the sons of Yoram, eleven. Solomon has two, with the probability that the first is also from his pen. Moses, Ethan, Heman have one each. In the LXX, Haggai and Zechariah are credited with four. Forty-nine are left anonymous.

That David organized the singers, that they would have psalms (though in the Hebrew they are called either "praises" or "prayers"), that these would be of larger number than some modern critics allow to David, are unquestionable facts. For Ewald gives David but ten, with fragments of others, while Prof. Cheyne, in his elaborate Bampton Lectures, finds but one pre-exilic psalm—the 18th. The 126th and 127th are post-exilic. Reasoning from that fact, Prof. Cheyne brings all down to a late date. Place a brick on the ground, then another on top of it projecting one-thirtieth of an inch, continue to pile bricks all with the same minute projection and all on the same side. One hundred may be piled thus without a fall. But one hundred and fifty can not. Thus Prof. Cheyne's argument projects just

a little with every psalm he takes up. The reasoning seems good for a time, but the center of gravity is passed somewhere.

The arguments employed to prove that David did not write some of the psalms ascribed to him are these:

David's Psalms 1. "Unequal in poetic merit." So is Browning. What poet does not have admirers who feel that some of his productions are inferior?

2. "Aramaisms." That would be possible if copyists added the word as a comment, in later centuries, when the Aramaic became the popular tongue. A special study of each instance, coupled with a more extensive acquaintance than is now open to scholars of the use of that kindred dialect, would be essential to an authoritative decision.

3. "Style corresponds with the psalms of a later age." But David became a model; later writers adopted his style.

4. "Non-adaptation to David's situation or character." That depends on the reader. "Thus some imply the existence of the Temple. Ps. 5:7a, 27:4, 28:2, 65:4, 68:29, 138:2." The Hebrew word for Temple was current as early as Eli's time. (1st Sam. 1:9, 3:3). There is, therefore, no reason at all to suppose that in the Psalms it must refer to Solomon's temple.

5. "Presuppose the circumstances or character of a later age." The varied circumstances of David's life had their counterpart in the national history. The nation suffered persecution, exaltation, exile and deliverance. So that it is easy to say that a psalm which speaks of these must refer to a national event and is, therefore, later than David. It is tenuous as an argument. These we have taken from Dr. Driver.†

Prof. Cheyne seems to feel that he has hung the Psalms on air, for he says it is necessary to invent another David to write the Psalms after the exile. To follow the argument closely would require a volume. We close with the remark that the wealth of the Psalms is probably less appreciated by the American people than by other intelligent nations.

†Driver's Introduction the Literature of the Old Testament, vv. 375-7.

THE PROVERBS.

This book is sometimes called the "Book of Wisdom Books. Wisdom", which title is applied to Ecclesiastes as well. The "Book of Wisdom" and "Ecclesiasticus" in the Apocrypha are imitations. "Proverb" is a narrow translation of the original term. The root, meaning "to be like", suggests a comparison, or similitude. Balaam's prophecy, Job's poem and Ezekiel's parables are called by the same term. It is translated "parable" once in the Proverbs (26:7). The book opens with praise of wisdom, which is personified and defined. The contrast with the Greek mind is very marked. The Greek "sophist" was an honorable title at first. It signified a wise man. But the sophists degraded their position for filthy lucre. Then arose the more modest term "philosopher", meaning a "lover of wisdom". The alert Greek endeavored to discover the underlying principle of all things. The Israelite declared, by intuition or by inspiration, the definition of practical wisdom to be the fear of the Lord. Whether in the magnificent exploration of Job, searching for wisdom throughout the universe, and finding it in the word of God in the morning of creation, or in the Proverbs, or in Ecclesiastes, after a long and gloomy journey, we arrive at the one conclusion, that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, to depart from evil is understanding.

The beautiful parallelism of the Hebrew poetry abounds in the Wisdom Books: there is always an addition to the meaning given in the second sentence, though it is sometimes very light.

"Let another man praise thee and not thine own mouth—

A stranger and not thine own lips."

Sometimes there is antithesis:

"Faithful are the wounds of a friend;

But the kisses of an enemy are deceitful."

The synthetic appears:

"Commit thy works unto the Lord;

And thy thoughts shall be established."

The parabolic form is used:

"As a jewel of gold in a swine's snout;

So is a fair woman without discretion."

Although the title would imply that all is the work of Solomon, a brief examination will show that only a portion is from

the wise king. Chapter 10 begins with these words: "The Proverbs of Solomon." The preceding nine chapters are an introduction by a later hand.

Following is an analysis:

- Not All by Solomon.** 1. The praise of wisdom. To the end of ch. 9.
 2. The proverbs of Solomon. 10 to 22:16.
 3. The words of the wise. 22:17 to the end of 24.
 4. Proverbs of Solomon copied by the men of Hezekiah. 25 to 29.
 5. The words of Augur. Ch. 30.
 6. The words of King Lemuel's mother. 31 to 31:10.
 7. The praise of a virtuous woman. 31:10 to end. This is anonymous. Verses arranged alphabetically.

"We have to deal with a compilation from different sources, as well as with a selection from the sayings of one man only, and one which in its present form was made some three centuries after the time of Solomon." Speaker's Commentary.

ECCLESIASTES.

The analysis of this book is difficult, for it seems as though the writer was moved from his original design by the contemplation of the evils of society. Discussion begins at the threshold. The title, "The Words of the Preacher, the son of David, King in Jerusalem", is peculiar. The last clause is found nowhere else. It is in apposition to "preacher", and evidently intends to convey the idea that Solomon wrote the book; "preacher" is "kobelet" in Hebrew, "Ecclesiastes" is the Greek equivalent. For this some critics wish to substitute the Hebrew word, which sounds pedantic, especially when spelled "qoheleth". It means "gatherer", or "debater". The thesis is the vanity of all earthly pursuits. Narrowly does the author escape the ranks of pessimists. First is a requiem over the vanity of everything; the dull monotony is the dirge of a burnt-out life. This prologue extends to the eleventh verse. The remainder may be presented in two natural divisions, with numerous subdivisions

- I. Proof of the vanity of this world: From
A Sad Refrain. personal experience and observation; predicated
 of the strife after wisdom and knowledge, after

pleasure and wealth; the fate that waits all, the uncertainty of the future, the weakness of man in the presence of oppression, envy, fruitless labor, isolation, fickleness; vanity in religion, danger from bad government, the unsatisfying nature of wealth. Man should enjoy all good given to him by God; ungratified desire, lack of prudence and helplessness. From 1:12 to 6:12.

II. Practical deductions from the above reflections. Earnestness, resignation, prudence, shunning of wickedness; reflections on woman, rulers and Providence. The problem of evil, the mysteries of wisdom with its failure to bring happiness, the duties of benevolence, piety, and trust in God. From 7:1 to 12:8.

III. The Epilogue. Object of the book and the conclusion of the whole matter: "Fear God and keep his commandments, this is the whole duty of man." From 12:9 to close.

Till Luther opened the question every one accepted the Solomonic authorship. At this time the consensus is decidedly the other way. The tradition, in this case, is unreasoning. Solomon's name is not found in the book, yet the opening leads to the belief that the writer wished to be considered as Solomon, or one speaking for him. This literary device was of much later origin than Solomon's time. The language used claims Solomonic penmanship. "I was king" could not be used by Solomon unless speaking after death. "I have gotten me more wisdom than all they that have been before me in Jerusalem," but David was the only king who preceded Solomon in Jerusalem, and that for only a portion of his reign. He repeats that thought in the next chapter. Severe criticism of the rule of the country, the high-handed injustice, the oppression of the poor, and the helplessness of the oppressed could not have been true in Solomon's day, if the presentation in Kings be correct. "Woe unto thee, O land! when thy king is a child" is later in the experience of Judah. There are a large number of such indications pointing to a much later date than Solomon, possibly as late as 300 B. C. Still, it is an open question if there be not much of the Solomonic wisdom in the refrain. Dean Alford gave it to Solomon.

Dr. Driver, who places the book some time in **Imperfect Teaching**, the third century B C, wisely says: "Of course Qoheleth takes a false view of life. His aphorisms are indeed often pregnant and just; they are prompted by keen sense of right; and in his satire upon society he lays his finger upon many a real blot. But his teaching as a whole, if followed consistently, would tend directly to paralyze human effort, to stifle every impulse to self-denial or philanthropy, to kill all activity of an ennobling or unselfish kind. . . . A life not circumscribed by merely personal ends, but quickened and sustained by devotion to the interests of humanity is not 'vanity' nor the pursuit of wind."

George Eliot is the koheleth of modern literature. Like the author of Ecclesiastes, she saw not the king in his beauty and life was sombre. To the keenest of psychological novelists the shade was the more visible and the future far from radiant. It were unjust, perhaps, to call these two writers "pessimists", but they are not optimistic. The Bible, revealing man as well as God, very appropriately has a treatise reflecting the feelings of those whose lives have been in the valley.

JOB.

Why Does Pain Exist?

The mystery of human suffering has elicited the profoundest reasoning since the beginning of thought. This book is the oldest contribution in literature. / The doctrine that suffering

is a result of sin and is a divine infliction is taught in the law and frequently inculcated in the book of Proverbs. The truth in it is sufficient to justify faith. Righteousness exalteth a nation, while sin is a reproach to any people. The way of the transgressor is hard, while a good man's steps are ordered of the Lord

Corporate bodies, whether nations or congregations, receive in this world the return for their deeds. For them there is no award beyond the grave. The law of Moses limited its penalties and its rewards to time. The day had not yet come for a full revelation.

Since Christ brought life and immortality to light, motives are drawn from eternity, but these potent factors were in the dark before He arose.

Under these limitations the discussion of this masterly work is carried on. The prologue which admits the reader behind the scenes was hidden from Job and his friends. The language, the arguments are in excellent taste and power; there is a naturalness about the speeches which has preserved the book from the imminent danger of being considered wholly fictitious.

**Satan's Opinion
of Man.**

Job was not an Israelite; probably Uz was in Edom. The prologue gives two scenes among the sons of God, with Satan among them. Twice Satan affirms that man is for sale, that he is religious because he is prosperous and well, twice he is permitted to afflict him, but not to take his life. In all these afflictions Job sinned not. There the story might have ended, but three or four friends (possibly more) gather to condole him. For seven days silence reigns, but thought is deep. Job begins the discussion, the friends follow. Elihu, the young man, waits till the arguments of the others are exhausted. He suggests the thought of chastisement, not punishment. The dramatic unity, if not the force and beauty, of the production are hindered by the young man's rather arrogant interpolation. Then God answers Job out of the tempest, not by meeting the arguments which have been advanced, but by an unrivalled description of nature. It is a presentation of the infinitude of creation, of the incomprehensibility of the divine government, designed to convince Job that he trespassed beyond his power of understanding. Job is further asked if he will undertake the government of the world. Two of the mighty creatures of God, behemoth and leviathan, or the hippopotamus and the crocodile, are described at length, and Job is asked if he can even manage them. Job confesses that he has been hasty and retracts his ill-considered words. Job's friends are reproved for their having spoken the thing which was not right concerning the divine rule. Job is commended and the final historical section places Job in prosperous circumstances.

That there was a historical basis, that the literary dress is of a later date are among the items where the critics agree. The date is placed from Moses to Jeremiah. An ancient tradition makes Moses the author; the advanced school of critics are disposed to bring it down to this side of Solomon.

THE PROPHETS.

Modern criticism has a thread of unscientific evolution, which tends to reduce the religious development of Israel to a purely human exercise. This has caused deeper study and a recasting of the view of the prophets. In the only theocracy of all time the prophets were statesmen as well as religious teachers. Together with the growing belief that miracles are more for the confirmation and enriching of faith than for artillery against unbelief is the emphasis on the work of the prophet as a counsellor of state and a reformer of the abuses of his own age. Thus, prediction, instead of being sole and supreme, is made coordinate, in some instances subordinate, and it may disappear, and yet the function of the prophet still exist. While the original meaning of the word is nebulous, there is no doubt that the prophet was a spokesman. Aaron was to be a prophet for the slow-tongued Moses; Aaron did not predict.

The prophet surveyed the past, the present and the future. As a historian he drew lessons from the past. He, by those examples of the dealings of God, enforced the duties of the present. As a seer, and as a preacher of righteousness, he declared the future, that thus the people might be brought to repentance and national prosperity.

Prediction is not eliminated from the Old Testament, except by the extremely radical. By others it is minimized; and some cherished passages can be held only by an uncritical faith. This fact makes the remainder brilliant with the light reflected from the fire which burns the dross.

In the opening chapters of Matthew we find three ways in which a prophecy may be fulfilled. This modern spirit of inquiry has enforced the lesson taught by Matthew. Prophecy is not a literal writing of an event. "History inverted," "the history of events before they come to pass," was Bishop Butler's definition. Instead of being the exact reproduction of the words of the inspired seer, as the photograph represents the person, fulfillment is, as Prof. Kirkpatrick of Cambridge states it, the unfolding of the plant from the seed. The microscope discloses the embryo plant in the germ, the botanist resolves all parts back to the leaf, so the fulfillment would have been known to a

mind capable of grasping the mighty purpose of God. All, root and fruit, come from the inspiration of the Holy One

**First of the
Prophets.**

In a review of the prophets, Moses would appear as the head of the line. Miriam, Aaron and Deborah are so called, but with the idea of speaking, or exhortation, or singing. In that sense the word appears in the New Testament, whose prophets rarely predict.

Samuel is the instructor of a school of prophets; Elijah and Elisha are of that class which was probably far more numerous than the history reveals. They were as showers—temporary, leaving no literary remains, yet necessary to advance the plan of God.

OBADIAH.

846 B. C.

It is agreed that Obadiah is very early or late. The Assyrians are not named by him, either because they have not yet devastated Judah, or because it has been so long past that it is not a burning question. Following Prof Kirkpatrick, we place him about 846 B. C. He has but one theme—that of the punishment of Edom for their cruel and unfriendly attitude toward Judah, when Jerusalem was pillaged. He predicts the overthrow of Edom and declares it to be caused by her conduct toward Judah. Israel is to escape, shall spread abroad, the dispersed shall return, and the kingdom shall be the Lord's.

JOEL.

837 B. C.

The same conclusion as regards date is reached in the case of Joel. Syria, Assyria and Babylon are not mentioned. A great natural calamity is fresh in the minds of the people, and this he makes his text, calling the people to repentance. The locusts had made an unparalleled invasion, and the course of the prophet's warning and exhortation is carried along the line of chastisement, repentance, forgiveness, blessing, the pouring out of the Spirit upon all flesh, the judgment of the nations, and the establishment of the perpetual kingdom of the Lord in holy Jerusalem. He was between 837 and 817 B. C. This is disputed, mainly on

linguistic grounds, by those who would place him in the fifth century.

JONAH.

763 B. C. This is not a prophecy, but is an exceedingly interesting history of a prophecy. Several lessons spring from it, as the control of God over nature, his rule among the nations of the earth, and the power of repentance to give life. Minor lessons abound. Jonah, son of Amittai, is called a prophet in 2d Kings 14:25. The strong probability is that Jonah preached about the time of the famous eclipse in June, 763 B. C.

AMOS.

760 B. C. While Jonah was sent to Nineveh, Obadiah to Edom, and Joel to Judah, the ten tribes were not left to themselves. Their kings were wicked men, yet Prof. Cornill has recently filed his brief in defense of Ahab, and in Elijah's time there were seven thousand who cherished the name of Jehovah. Amos and Hosea, not far from 755, spoke for God to Israel. Amos preceded. If his prophecy is read as being the heads of his discourses, each division forming the sermon for a day, the prophet will be seen coming from the other kingdom with an unwelcome message, then shrewdly gaining a hearing. Suppose he devotes a day to Damascus. He dilates on her sins, and prophesies the punishment that will descend upon the beauteous city. His auditors would enjoy that and come out the next day. Then he told of the transgression of the Philistines and predicted their utter ruin. The following day he preached the funeral of Tyre, much to the appreciation of his hearers, who had not listened to such an able preacher for a long time. His popularity grew as he detailed the chastisement of Edom, of Ammon, of Moab, of Judah, all of which would endear him to his audience. Then came Israel, where the prophecy is given at length. He closes in a vein similar to that of Joel.

HOSEA.

755 to 725 B. C. Hosea followed Amos. His matrimonial experience, with a wife who was false to her vows, and the significant names of his children form

the basis of his plea. He speaks from a heart of sorrow that was thus enabled to feel and express the sorrow of God for a rebellious people. Whether the command to take a wife of whoredom was actual, or in vision, is a mooted question. In either event the practical lesson for this day is, that the Father may better prepare his messenger by a discipline of affliction than by any theological course. Hosea had a hard field. That is always good. God puts burdens on shoulders broad enough to bear them. "Sorrow is knowledge," said Byron. The Lord has a controversy with the people of America, but not like that of Israel, where there was no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God. (4:1). The prophecy ends with the restoration of Israel. Thirty years later, the ten tribes were deported to the Euphrates, and the kingdom of Israel was at an end. Amos presents God as a God of justice. Hosea gives the complementary truth, he is a God of love.

ISAIAH.

Returning to Jerusalem, we find an exceptional prophet, in the person of Isaiah. From the year that King Uzziah died, for fifty years he uttered his prophecies. He saw the fall of the Northern Kingdom. He was accessory to the overthrow of Sennacherib. According to tradition, under Manasseh he was placed in a split tree and sawed in two. Isaiah was a prophet of great boldness. He was in earnest and was determined to be heard. Only one of the five kings under whom he lived was a God-fearing man. Isaiah is uncompromising. He could reason; he could cut with keen sarcasm. Withal he was a man of spirituality and reverence. He easily stands at the head of the prophets as a man of varied and great talent. Other prophets excel in some one particular. Isaiah combines all in symmetry and perfection. His prophecies are too long for minute analysis in this connection. The received prophecy of Isaiah has sixty-six chapters. But the last thirty-nine are claimed for an unknown writer. Some of the prophecies in the former portion must, by the same logic, be taken from the first Isaiah. Postponing this question till it rises in chronological order, we next have a contemporary with Isaiah.

MICAH.

735 B. C. Micah was in Jerusalem, probably between 735 and 725. Hezekiah's reformation was not so thorough as it seems upon the surface. All the high places were not removed, nor the high looks rendered humble. Micah is a poet of deep feeling. He sincerely bewails the sins he beholds, and he knows the ultimate result. He classes himself among those who are condemned when God has a suit against His people. The Messianic prophecies are strong and hopeful.

NAHUM.

640 B. C. In the reign of Josiah. Nahum prophesied about 640 B. C. But not in Jerusalem. He wrote in Assyria, and the burden of his prophecy is the approaching destruction of Nineveh. It was after the sack of Thebes, which he quotes as a warning. That was near 662. Nineveh fell in 607. For 2400 years the city was lost. The archaeologist has lately unearthed her palaces and given her libraries to the world. The precise predictions of the prophet have been accurately fulfilled. Nahum bears testimony to one truth, viz: the inevitable destruction of every kingdom, and by consequence, of every scheme built on a basis of force and fraud. To Nahum, the city of Nineveh is the embodiment of evil, while Judah stands in righteousness. He had a contemporary who was of gentle blood, who was well acquainted with the iniquities of the upper classes in Jerusalem, and who took a wider view of the impending judgment.

ZEPHANIAH.

640 B. C. The storm of judgment which Zephaniah foresaw was to sweep westward to Philistia, eastward to Moab and Ammon, southward to Ethiopia, and northward to Nineveh. It was a judgment of the nations. The reformation of Josiah postponed the dark day for Jerusalem; yet it came. Beyond the judgment the prophet saw a glorious day when God should be universally worshipped. He has no prophecy of the Messiah, but some of his revelations of the future are yet before us. Every lift to foreign missions helps to fulfill the prophecy of Zephaniah.

HABAKKUK.

It is meet that man should reason with God. In
609 B. C. humility, Hezekiah so reasoned in prayer, and
 God heard. Moses reasoned in regard to the
 proposal to destroy the wilful children of Israel and to rear another nation. Habakkuk begins with a bold expostulation with the Lord. The lawlessness, oppression, violence, plundering, strife and contention offend him. Long has he pleaded with God for interposition, but there is no reply. Jehovah now answers that he is raising up the Chaldeans to carry the sword of his wrath. The prophet is surprised that He who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity should use a wicked people, and give to them such power. The answer is given to the prophet, with instruction to write it upon a tablet and place it where he may run that readeth it.

“Behold his soul is puffed up, it is not upright within him;

But the righteous shall live in his faithfulness.” (2:4).

The first clause refers to the Chaldean. He is boastful and unrighteous; there is no life for him. The second refers to the Israelite—one who is an Israelite indeed. He shall live, whatever be the catastrophes of earth. Paul and Luther made memorable use of this text. Out of it, on Pilate's steps, in Rome, sprang the Reformation.

The prophet taunts the Chaldean, so confident in his temporary prosperity. Their idols cannot defend them. This occupies the remainder of the second chapter. The third is the prophet's comment on the second clause. It is a prayer and an answer. It has underlying it the fear that the Israelite may grow weary—waiting for the reward of his faithfulness. This prompts the prayer that God will revive his work. Then comes the thought which is really an answer. It is the vision of God coming to judge and to deliver. The imagery is taken from the history of Israel's deliverance from Egypt. It was this prayer that Benjamin Franklin read in one of the drawing rooms of Paris, eliciting murmurs of admiration. The company was surprised to learn that it was taken from the Bible. Habakkuk prophesied about 609.

JEREMIAH.

Jeremiah prophesied for a half century—627 to 577. The nation under King Josiah was prosperous. A religious reformation was in progress when he began. He saw a nation die. His book is a history, a biography, and a prophecy, all in one. His life was a martyrdom. His confession of human weakness touches us all. His testimony to God-given strength is for our comfort. Jeremiah sustained Josiah's reformation. He preached repentance. The hopes of Judah went down when Josiah fell at Megiddo. To give a summary of Jeremiah's work is to set forth the history of Judah during those years of stubborn folly—of national suicide. Twice the people rejected his message publicly. Once he was directed to take his stand in the Temple court and to declare his message. He was seized, charged with the accusation used twice in the New Testament—of speaking of the destruction of the Temple. The people clamored for his life. Some of the elders interposed and saved the fearless preacher. The next occasion was when the king cut the roll which Baruch had written at Jeremiah's dictation. This was the rejection of Jehovah's message by the head of the nation. After the eighteen-months siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar the end came (586). Zedekiah, the king, was captured near Jericho, his children were put to death before his eyes, he was blinded and carried in fetters to Babylon. Gedaliah was appointed governor, though only the poorest of the people were left in the land. Gedaliah was murdered, and the remaining Jews fled in terror to Egypt, probably taking Jeremiah with them. There tradition has him stoned to death. Such a life of affliction is almost without a parallel in literature. Jeremiah made three prophecies which we may note. One was the restoration to their own land of the captive people; the second is the new covenant; the third is the judgment of all nations.

This brings us to the prophets of the Exile.

EZEKIEL.

Eleven years before the destruction of Jerusalem, Nebuchadnezzar took the cream of its people. Among the captives was the young priest Ezekiel. In the year 592 he received his commission to

prophecy. The latest date he gives is 570. The exiles were not slaves. Land was assigned them and they built houses. The true prophets advised them to seek the good of the land where they were taken. So long as the Temple was standing, many of the captives believed the oracles of the false prophets, who gained popularity by assuring the exiles of a speedy return. The destruction of the city of Jerusalem and the burning of the Temple shattered their hopes, and they became despondent.

1. The first division of Ezekiel's prophecies occupied four and a half years. They are gloomy. They predict the destruction of the Holy city, and the desolation of Israel. They reach from chapter 1 to 24 inclusive. They were unwelcome, and probably received a small hearing.

2. From the time that Nebuchadnezzar began his year-and-a-half siege of Jerusalem till the messenger came with tidings of the overthrow, Ezekiel had no message for Judah, but filled his pages with prophecies of the fate of the nations surrounding Israel. Moab, Ammon, Tyre, Philistia, Egypt, all pass under review. (25 to 32.)

3. With the 33d chapter begins the final division. (33 to 48.) It is addressed to the captives. With the same confident pen with which he had foretold the destruction, he now foretells the restoration, the rebuilding of the city and of the Temple. He idealizes the worship. In this he displays the perfect adaptation of each prophet's message to the men of his time. When Isaiah began to prophesy, men were treading the courts of the Temple in a careless way. They had a heartless worship. That prophet's denunciation of the worship is so strong that it sounds like a probation. So it is—of a worship of the lips while the heart is far away. But Ezekiel, when the people are powerless to visit the Temple, exalts that worship. The reason is clear: body as well as soul are to be enlisted in the service of the Lord. In every age, some have gone to one extreme, some to the other. Ritualism and purely mental worship are prevalent in these modern days. Isaiah and Ezekiel really stand together in respect to Temple worship. Both demand clean hands and pure hearts.

THE UNKNOWN; OR, THE SECOND ISAIAH.

Two Isaiahs. The latter half of Isaiah, beginning with the fortieth chapter, is supposed, by many, to have been written by an unknown prophet, in Baby-

lon, at the time when Cyrus was winning the victories which gave him Babylon, and which led to the deliverance of the Jews. The argument does not stop here, but finds twelve chapters out of the first section, which were added to the genuine prophecies of Isaiah. To take all these in order would require a longer dissertation than is germane to our purpose. It will be sufficient to examine the arguments which are relied upon by both sides. There is agreement that the second section was addressed to the captives in Babylon; that the prophet writes as though he were among them; that there are both differences and correspondences in style and tone. In favor of the unity of Isaiah the evidence is both external and internal.

1. The version of the LXX, about 250 B. C., has the book as we have received it, by one Isaiah.

2. Jesus, the son of Sirach, in 180 B. C., a famous scholar, quotes the second part and calls it Isaiah.

3. The New Testament writers, Matt. 3:3, etc.; Mark 1:2; Luke 3:4-6; John 1:28, 12:38; Paul, Rom. 10:16-21; Acts 8:38-34; Luke 4: 16-20 quote from this portion and call it Isaiah. Jesus preached from one of the selections from the second Isaiah, and Philip preached from Isa. 53d.

4. Josephus mentions a tradition among the Jews, that Cyrus was pleased when shown the prophecy of Isaiah concerning him.

Evidence in the Book. Thus the tradition for 2400 years is on the side of Isain authorship. The internal evidence as massed by Prof. George Rawlinson, is arranged under five heads.

1. The identity of the greatness and the quality of the genius displayed by the writer. Isaiah stands in the front rank of prophets.

2. The similarity in language and constructions. This is conceded by most of the opposing side and explained by the influence of Isaiah upon the prophetic guild. An author saturated with the words of the elder Isaiah would thus fall into the same habit of construction.

3. The similarity between the thoughts and images and rhetorical ornaments of the two is very evident. By the new school this is also accounted for by the permanence of truth and the influence of Isaiah's teaching. About twenty-five correspondences have been pointed out.

4. Similarity in little characteristic expressions. "The Holy One of Israel", "Jacob", combined with "Israel", "the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it", "saith the Lord" in the middle or at the end of a verse, "lifting up an ensign", "chaos", God's people designated as "outcasts", "from henceforth even forever", are among the expressions found in both portions.

5. Correspondences, partly in the way of repetitions, partly in the way of completion in the second portion, of thoughts left incomplete in the former. Thus, "vain oblations", 1:13 and 66:3; "gardens", 1:29 and 66:17; "The zeal of the Lord", 9:7 and 37:32; "holy mountain", 11:9 and 65:25. There are sixteen more of these correspondences. Besides this, the local coloring is that of Palestine. The allusions to scenery, to the mountains, forests, streams and trees are almost exclusively of the land of Israel. The palm, which was so common in the plains of Babylonia, is not named. The oaks, sycamores, firs and pines of the west abound.

It has been further noticed that the bisection leads to dissection, and thus to absurdity. Ewald found seven writers for Isaiah.

The theory of diverse authorship says:

Two Authors.

1. In regard to external testimony, the fact that the LXX and the son of Sirach class it with Isaiah no more proves that it belongs to Isaiah than a quotation today by a scholar from Mark 16:9-20 would prove that that portion was written by Mark. How else can the closing verses of Mark be quoted? All that the external testimony proves, in this case, is that the closing chapters were given to Isaiah in their day.

There is one item of external evidence which, though small, is stubborn. In Matthew 27:9 is found a quotation from the prophets which is ascribed to Jeremiah. It is in Zechariah. The best explanation is that adopted by the Speaker's commentary, which is that the sacred writings were in rolls, that the

writer who was at the head of the roll gave name to that roll; that Jeremiah headed the roll on which Zechariah was written.

The reader has doubtless noticed that the epistles in the New Testament are not well arranged. They follow neither a chronological, nor a logical, nor a scientific order, but are placed according to length. Paul, being the most voluminous writer, is at the head. His longest epistle comes first, then the others according to length. Hebrews being next in length, and also Pauline, follows Paul's epistles. Then the others, according to their size. Galatians and Hebrews ought to have preceded Romans. A chronological arrangement would have been superior. In this rule the Christians followed the Rabbins. Isaiah comes first as the longest, then Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel. Before Daniel was ranked as a prophet, the order was, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah. It is thus in the Talmud and in the MSS Old Testament of the French and the German Jews. This can be explained only by the supposition that Isaiah was shorter than the other two. Chronologically he preceded them, consequently his position after them admits no other explanation.

Solomon was not the author of all the Proverbs: Psalms were added after David, who, with Ezra, added to the law of Moses: hence arises the theory that Isaiah may be a collection of the utterances of that mighty mind and of other similar oracles. If that were true, then Isaiah would increase in length. Or if the prophecy of the Babylonian prophet were on the same roll, and thus, being nameless, became attached to that of Isaiah and called by his name, this would account for his change of position to the head of the roll of prophets. This forms one difficulty in the way of the traditional theory which has not yet been explained. It is the only approach to external testimony advanced by the new school.

2. The internal evidence from language and style can be claimed by the advanced view with as much composure. "The terse, compact, forcible oratory of Isaiah is replaced by a measured, though impassioned, eloquence: the vigorous rhetoric of action, by the pathetic pleading of suffering. Careful examination shows that a considerable number of words and phrases characteristic of Isaiah are entirely absent from these chapters, or occur in them but rarely; and conversely, that a considerable number of words and phrases occur in these chapters which are

not found in the acknowledged prophecies of Isaiah; while not a few words and phrases which occur once or twice in Isaiah, without any special force, are used in a different and specific sense."† The new ideas in the second portion, such as Israel as Jehovah's servant, and that idea expanded into the suffering Servant of Isa. 53d, and the contrast between the true God and the idols are indications of another mind. The Messianic king of the first portion does not appear in the second. Jehovah is the only king. The supremacy of Jehovah receives marked treatment in the second section. The Messiah is presented as a sufferer. This was unwelcome to the Jewish mind; it is in contrast with Isa. 9th, where the Messiah is a mighty counsellor and victorious king. The first section has the "Lord of Hosts" or the "Lord God of Hosts" fifty-seven times; the second section does not employ the latter phrase and has the former but eight times in twenty-seven chapters. To the first writer, God is a Judge, a Husbandman; to the second He is One, the Only God of the universe, the Creator, the Orderer of the Ages. Amos led the way in calling Israel a woman. The first portion has this figure but once, and then it is historical, found also in Kings. It is the daughter of Jerusalem exulting over Sennacherib. The second author lingers over this relation. He speaks of Israel as a bride, a mother, a widow. (Chaps. 44, 51, 52, 54, 54, 60.)

The local coloring being Palestine, will be understood by those who have entered into the feelings of exiles. The old men would dwell on the features of Palestine, the young would drink it in eagerly. With their dislike for the plain of Babylon, it is not a matter of wonder if the prophet would choose such natural objects as would arouse a stronger desire for the Return.

3. The opinion of two-fold authorship, traverses no Scripture. Nowhere is it said that Isaiah wrote these closing chapters. Eleven times that section is quoted in the New Testament; one of these is by the Teacher. In that, instead of saying "Isaiah", he says, "this Scripture" (Luke 4:17).

In the other instances of reference by Matthew, Luke, John or Paul the case is similar to a reference now to the final portion of Mark. There is no other way to refer to it. The scholar who believes that there was another writer, nevertheless quotes that section as though it were by Isaiah. There is no other

†The Doctrine of the Prophets, p. 360.

manner by which he can refer to it, unless he resort to a long paraphrase. If there were a declaration in the closing verses of the second gospel that they were written by Mark, or if other writers so affirmed, critical opinion could hardly set aside direct historical testimony. So all the differences in style, in language, in view-point, which make up the critical decision that a later hand penned the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah, would fail in face of an explicit declaration that they are the work of Isaiah.

4. The book itself furnishes the best argument. Read Isaiah till you cross the disputed boundary, the jar is violent. For Isaiah holds out his hands all day to a stubborn but gain saying people. Suddenly he cries "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people saith your God." They are yet rebellious, the high places were not entirely removed, the spirit of idolatry and disobedience was merely slumbering, ready to break out in Manasseh's day; they were not a people whom God was willing to comfort. The message continues to comfort Jerusalem with the assurance that her warfare was accomplished, her iniquity pardoned, she had received double for all her sins. These assertions were not true in Isaiah's day. There is no foundation for the supposition that God transported Isaiah 150 years forward to the time of the end of the exile. That is as violent a hypothesis as is that of another writer. When Nebuchadnezzar was drawing near to the gates, where he besieged Jerusalem for eighteen months, Jeremiah prophesied the taking of the city, the seventy years captivity and the restoration. That is a consistent prophecy. But for Isaiah to break in with a strong word of consolation to people who were not weeping, who were proud and defiant; for him to say to Jerusalem that her iniquity was pardoned, when the cup of her iniquity was not filled till the next reign; to say that she was pardoned, when the word was 150 years premature, is so incongruous with the facts that the interpreter is obliged to admit that they do not apply, and must necessarily be transferred to a later date and another land containing a different class of persons.

5. The terms used expressive of time plant the writer of the second section in the vicinity of Babylon and near the year 546 B. C. For he is in the midst of a people disheartened by a long and almost hopeless captivity. Some are in despair, some hope for relief by a king of David's line. The daughter of Zion lies prostrate in the dust; the chains of her captivity are about her

neck; Jerusalem is in ruins. "Zion is a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation. Our holy and beautiful house, where our fathers praised Thee, is burnt with fire, and all our pleasant things are laid waste" (64:10-11). What advantage would come in telling this to haughty sinners one hundred years before the captivity began? These things are said to be past. Not in the rapt vision of a seer on the isle of Patmos, but as sober history. Further, God says he has raised a righteous man from the east and from the north (41:2-25); the islands tremble before him (41:5), so that Cyrus has united the Persians and Medes and marched to Asia Minor. In 549 he defeated Astyages and fused the two empires; in 546 he conquered Lydia and captured Sardis. Eight years later Babylon fell. This prophecy fits into this eight years exactly. God says of Cyrus: "Whose right hand have I holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates and the gates shall not be shut" (45:1). The argument of this paragraph is in this verse. God *has* held, and *will* open the gates of Babylon. The past and the future.

Moses and Jesus spoke of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. In both cases it is future and is so described. Moses depicts creation. It is past, and harmonious in presentation. The sufferings of Christ, in this writer (chapter 53), are in prophetic vision beheld as having occurred. The visions of John in Patmos are in the past. In these instances the proprieties of language are observed. But when historical assertions are made, saying that Jerusalem is desolate, the Temple burned with fire, that Cyrus has already been called and has gone forth, gained some victories and will gain more till Babylon shall fall, and the people shall be released, and the city and the Temple be rebuilt, we have statements which no figure of rhetoric will cover. All may be called history; that which is prediction is to be taken literally because it was thus fulfilled. If Isaiah had written all these things he would have been consistent, either to represent them as in the present, or in the past by a prophetic vision, or to posit them as future. Jeremiah chooses the latter.

A. Campell said of Isa. 62:10: "Spoken in reference to the situation of the people addressed, who were in the midst of Babylon. It was necessary that they should remove hence, ere

they could come to Zion.”† The two-fold theory was propounded six hundred years ago. Mr. Campbell was accustomed to choose his words carefully. By several phrases he commits himself to that belief or is guilty of ill-considered speech. “Spoken” is crucial. If the words were spoken, the speaker must have been with the people to whom he spoke “in reference to the situation of the people”. The words are an exhortation to prepare a highway. That would be meaningless to the people of Isaiah’s day. The people addressed “were in the midst of Babylon”, therefore the speaker was there.

5. Indirect testimony is borne by two men who were in Babylon. The first is Ezra. He says (1:1): “Now in the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia, that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, that he made a proclamation” etc. The second exile is Daniel (9:2): “I, Daniel, understood by books, the number of the years whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.”

The second portion of Isaiah is much more minute than the prophecy of Jeremiah; it is more extensive; it names the deliverer. Yet neither of these men mention that sublime prophecy. This does not amount to a positive argument, but it puts no obstacle in the way of other lines of reasoning. The omission demands a reasonable explanation.

6. If the prophecy were not attached to that of Isaiah, there would be no one to contend that it was by his pen. Suppose it were after Daniel, and called by the first Hebrew word *nacham* (comfort), it would not occur to men of this day to throw it back into Isaiah’s arms. There is no claim in it for Isaian authorship. His name does not occur, while the frequency with which it is found in the first portion (together with the personal pronoun I) reminds us of Henry Ward Beecher’s argument against the Pauline authorship of Hebrews: “Paul could not have written Hebrews without saying I, I, I.” That so able a writer should be lost to fame seems improbable. However, if Ruth can step forth in virgin sweetness, with its author unknown; if forty-nine psalms have dropped the names of their composers in the stream of oblivion; if the stately epic of Job, with its powerful

†Memoirs. Vol. I p. 338. Quoted by B. B. Tyler.

argument, forgot the name of the author in the deep contemplation of the theme; if the lofty reasoning of the epistle to the Hebrews descends to us from an impenetrable cloud, then it is not so strange if the second portion of the impassioned prophecy of Isaiah is delivered to us with the marks of an author whose name was lost in the dust and turmoil and rapture of the Return.

The name "Isaiah" was carried by several men in the history of Israel. That some devout admirer of the great Isaiah named his son, born in the captivity, after the prophet; that this young Isaiah became a zealous student of Isaiah, and was thus fitted to be the prophet of Consolation, is an explanation so simple that it has never been suggested.

HAGGAI.

It is possible that Haggai was taken prisoner to Babylon in 586, and returned with Zerubbabel in 537. The people erected the altar of burnt offering in its ancient place and restored the daily sacrifice. They began to build the Temple, but opposition arose from the Samaritans, and their zeal flagged. The people lacked spirit, they were easily cowed, and gave up the work. For fifteen years nothing more was done; then came the voice of Haggai. He is a prophet of duty. Rugged, straightforward, he does not manifest any grace of oratory or flight of imagination, but insists that the work shall be done. His argument was enforced by calamity. Drought and famine became a supplementary conscience, which inclined the people to hear and to heed. Haggai's prophecies occupied only about four months. They were all devoted to the rebuilding of the Temple. The suffering from the drought was the text, the promise of Jehovah to be with them was their strength. The aged men wept when they compared the house which the poverty-stricken Jews were building with the glory of Solomon's Temple. Haggai gave the promise that the glory of that Temple should be greater because of the presence of Jehovah. He reminds them of the law of holiness, and exalts Zerubbabel as the servant of Jehovah.

ZECHARIAH.

Before Haggai ceased his brief prophecy Zechariah came to his assistance. He has a series of visions. First, Jehovah's

messengers report the earth to be at rest. The angel of Jerusalem intercedes for the holy city, and is given assurance of God's favor and of His will that the Temple shall be built. Four horns next appear. They represent the powers which have scattered Judah; beside them stand the workmen ready to destroy them. A man comes to measure Jerusalem, but is told that Jerusalem shall expand beyond all measure, while Jehovah shall be her walls. This finds fulfilment in the Jerusalem which is from above (Gal. 4:26). Satan accuses Joshua, the high priest, but Joshua is defended and honored. Zerubbabel is similarly encouraged by the vision of the golden lamp and the two olive trees, signifying an undying source of grace and strength for Israel. Every mountain of difficulty is to become a plain. But holiness is the aim of God's work among the people. Two visions express the removal of sin. A flying roll, thirty feet long and fifteen feet wide, with theft and perjury written upon it, enters into the houses of the guilty to consume them utterly. Then a woman called Wickedness was placed in an ephah, a weight of lead was placed on top, and the ephah was lifted up by two women who could fly, and was borne to the land of Shinar. This is the removal of sin from God's people. Then the powers of heaven are seen going forth in chariots to inflict divine judgments upon the nations. The prophet was directed to make a crown of gold, and to crown the high priest, Joshua, typical of the crowning of the One who is to come to His Temple. Two years later Zechariah was asked whether the fasts in commemoration of the destruction of Jerusalem, which were observed twice in a year in Babylon, need to be longer observed. The answer teaches a spiritual worship, commands them to obey what God has inculcated, and prophesies great prosperity for the nation.

The last six chapters of Zechariah are unusually complicated. The author's name, which appears so often in the first portion, does not here come forth. First, the destruction of the nations closely bordering on Israel (within her promised boundaries), is described; then Zion is bidden to welcome the Messianic king, meek, lowly, riding upon an ass. He destroys the implements of war and rules in universal peace. The prayer to idols is condemned: the tyrannical rulers will be judged; the scattered of Israel shall return.

A fire consumes the cedars of Lebanon, a fierce storm lays

low the oaks of Bashan. That is, the storm of war sweeps away the mighty ones of the nations. The prophet is directed to feed the flock. He takes two staves, calling them "Graciousness" and "Union", to indicate the grace of God toward His people and the union of Judah and Israel. They reject His rule. He breaks the staves to show the end of Jehovah's protection. A futile attempt to besiege Jerusalem is next depicted. The deliverance by Jehovah opens the eyes of Judah to her God. Then a sword is commanded to strike the Shepherd: two-thirds of the people perish, and the remainder, purified by fire, will return to the true worship of Jehovah. The book closes with judgment of the nations, who gather to war against Jerusalem. Half the people go into captivity. Then the Lord will go forth to fight against those nations. At the touch of his feet the Mount of Olives will be cleft asunder. Living waters shall go forth from Jerusalem, and the Lord shall be king over all the earth. Jerusalem shall be in the midst of a vast plain; it shall never again be destroyed, and holiness unto the Lord shall be even upon the bells of the horses, and every pot and vessel shall be holy.

MALACHI.

Whether this be a proper noun or not is questioned. It is found nowhere else as a name. It is identical with the Hebrew word for "my messenger" in chap. 3:1. The oldest versions do not recognize it as a proper name. An ancient Jewish tradition refers the book to Ezra. The prophet begins with a reminder to the Jews of God's favor shown to Israel and the punishment to Edom. Then he blames the priests for their profanation of the Temple service. They permitted blemished animals to be offered. Already in heathen lands a pure offering is made to the name of Jehovah. A curse is threatened to the priests for their failure to teach the people knowledge. He turns to the people to condemn their mixed marriages and the repudiation of their Israelite wives. There are some who denied that God punished the evil. For them is the assurance that the Judge will appear in His Temple in the person of the angel of the covenant. He will separate the godly from the wicked, and will purify the righteous in the furnace of affliction. How could they expect blessings from God, whom they had robbed of His tithes and offerings. Murmurers complained that there was no profit in

His service, but they who feared the Lord spake oft to one another; they shall be the jewels of the Lord, while the others shall be ashes. Before that day Elijah shall come and the Sun of Righteousness shall arise. Meanwhile they are to observe the law of Moses. Four hundred years passed away before the silence was broken; then it was by the greatest prophet born of woman. Malachi closes ominously. His bold arraignment of the priests and people is followed by the unfaltering affirmation of a sure and final judgment. The last word of that ministration of death is "curse". Yet the silver lining is visible. The Sun is to rise, the shadows will flee away, and the distinction between the righteous and the wicked will be clearly seen.

Prophecy Has a Lesson for Us. The prophetic writings cover less than four hundred years. Their attitude toward the law is worthy of study. They were not law-

makers, yet they declared the will of God with an originality and energy that practically changed the conception of the teaching of the law. They were teachers of morality, preachers of righteousness, and voices of God. As statesmen they would have kept the ship from the rocks if their counsel had been accepted. As preachers they were the harbingers and advocates of a spiritual worship. The priest had no option; he was to slavishly follow the ritual law. The prophet could break the letter, to better reach the spirit, which confers life. As prophets seeing the better days to come, they taught men to look beneath the surface to the underlying principles of the law; to look beyond their offerings to the time when God would dwell with every contrite heart, to anticipate the time when God would indeed be in their midst. Matthew Arnold sends those who wish to make progress in righteousness to the Hebrew prophets for inspiration, for there they will find a glow and a force which can be found nowhere else. Carlyle was fed on the Hebrew prophets in his boyhood; they framed his ideal of justice, scathing all indifference, and scorching all unreality.

The spiritual Israel has her prophets. There were no voices strong enough to prevent the Church of God going into captivity into Babylon; there have been many holy oracles calling her back to Jerusalem. From time to time, in various portions of the vast field God has summoned his spokesmen. As each prophet

had some special feature of truth and its corresponding duty, so every seer of these late centuries has the truth burned in upon his soul which he must give to his fellowmen. Nor is it to be forgotten that there were false prophets.

The lessons which the prophets have to teach us are far from being exhausted when we have taken out their testimony to the Christ. The eternal truths which they proclaimed still abide, more enduring than the stars, and furnishing an antidote to a gospel of sweet cream, and a tonic to an age which has forgotten that God is just.

In passing to the criticism of the Pentateuch,
Conclusions. some conclusions may be recorded:

1. The title of a book is not decisive of authorship. In the Apocrypha we have "The Wisdom of Solomon". From internal evidence it is rejected. It has good thoughts. "God made not death" is one which would be a strong antidote to the blame sometimes placed on God for what the devil has done.

2. A book may be ascribed to an author when he has written but a fraction of its contents.

3. Anonymity does not deprive a book of value. The anonymous psalms, the pastoral of Ruth, the close reasoning of Hebrews, are as welcome and as profitable as if we knew who wrote each one.

4. A book may have been put into its present form centuries after the death of the main author.

5. Inaccuracy of title does not invalidate the contents of a book, nor make them untrue. The observations of Ecclesiastes and the conclusion reached are as potent, whether written by Solomon or not.

If David did not write all the psalms, if Solomon was not the author of all the proverbs, if Isaiah did not write all the prophecies ascribed to him, then it is possible that Moses did not write all the laws. Faith is not imperiled by a literary criticism. On the threshold of the examination of the Pentateuchal criticism we have no theological prejudice to overcome, nor is there any intellectual barrier. Is the new theory true? If so, we wish to know it. If so, it will vindicate its value. It is as fascinating to be an iconoclast as to be a martyr. But we give fair warn-

ing, we bow to no pope. The new theory must remember that the old has the right of possession. The new must win its spurs by stout argument, by reasoning in which we can detect no fallacy. The courteous and scholarly advocates of that theory will not object if we scrutinize every step of the way.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF THE THEORIES.

Traditional or Biblical Theory. That the Pentateuch, substantially as we have it, was written by Moses; and "Joshua" either by the doughty captain or by some one of his companions, is the oldest view taken of the Hexateuch.

Certain concessions or explanations by the majority of the conservative school should be understood.

1. Moses may have used ancient documents in composing the book of Genesis. It is probable that he did. This does not concede that he did the work so unskillfully that the modern critic can detect the seams. Principal Alfred Cave thinks Moses was J.

2. The writing may have been done by amanuenses. Thus "Romans" was written by Tertius. This would suggest an explanation of some things which have been used as objections to the Mosaic authorship.

3. Explanatory notes written on the margin, in a day when foot notes were unknown, have crept into the text. Not a dozen in nearly 6,000 verses.

4. The concluding chapter of Deuteronomy was added probably by Joshua.

This theory has been called the biblical theory. The unbroken usage of the Old Testament is to ascribe the law to Moses. The Apocrypha continues this assignment, which naturally passes into the New Testament.

Philo (B. C. 30-A. D. 10) was a very competent scholar. He represents the best higher criticism of his day—the Alexandrian school. His was probably the first life of Moses. Though ac-

quainted with the tradition that Ezra restored the law, he gives it unqualifiedly to Moses.

Josephus (37-100) wrote the antiquities of the Jews, in twenty books. He held firmly to the Mosaic authorship.

Manetho (B. C. 270-240) represents the Egyptian school. He says that Moses gave to the Hebrews their polity and their laws.

Herataeus, a Greek historian (55-176) calls, Moses the Jewish lawgiver. He states that the laws were written and were called a revelation from God.

Lysimachus of Alexandria (B. C. 10-A. D. 30) cordially hated the Jewish law. He called Moses a cheat and an imposter, but says that he wrote the law.

Tacitus (55-117), the grim Roman historian, follows Lysimachus. Juvenal (Sat. 14, 102, cir. 100 A. D.) alludes to "the law which Moses delivered to the Jews in his mystic volume".

Thus far Moses has no rival. Celsus (cir. 190) denied that Moses wrote Genesis, but we know not on what grounds.

Origin of Modern Theories. Carstadt, three years older than Luther, at first his supporter, but later an opposer, a man of impetuous temper and extreme views, was

the first to hold that Moses did not write the Pentateuch. Only an insane man, he said, could believe that Moses wrote the record of his own death. Josephus held that Moses was inspired to write that chapter before his death.

Thomas Hobbes, a gifted writer and a materialist, denied the Mosaic authorship. Still he said: "Yet he wrote all that he is there said to have written." The analyses of today do not give Moses anything.

Benedict Spinoza (1632-1677), a pantheistic philosopher, an original thinker, a man with many noble traits, arranged the objections to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. He classed the historical books as a selection made out of a larger number by Ezra.

Among the Roman Catholics, Masius, Peyrerius and Richard Simon denied the Pentateuch to Moses. Masius merely held that the Pentateuch was revised by Ezra. Peyrerius recanted. Simon gave the laws to Moses, the annals to other hands. His book was burned by the church.

Le Clerc and Von Dale modified Moses's work by other hands-

Vitringa (1708), a Protestant, is the father of the document theory, though Astruc receives the praise. Vitringa taught that Moses in writing Genesis had used documents written by the patriarchs. He was sustained by Calmet and Bishop Gleig.

Witsius admitted four interpolations, and Graves six. Adam Clarke and Prideaux admit additions by Ezra.

**Documentary
Theory.**

Jean Astruc, a Roman Catholic, whose father was a Protestant minister, who entered the Catholic church on the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), when Jean was a year old, was a physician in Paris but fond of theological studies. His "Conjectures," as he called them, were put forth with timidity in 1753. Against Spinoza he defended the Mosaic authorship of Genesis. In that he saw two great documents using "Elohim" and "Jehovah", and nine lesser writings. These documents Moses had edited with slight change.

In the same year Bishop Lowth published his work on the Parallelisms in the Hebrew sacred poetry.

Johann C. Eichhorn (1752-1827), thirty years later, extended Astruc's theory to the entire Pentateuch. He pointed out corresponding differences in style and gave the name "Higher Criticism" to the study. Most of the documents were, in his judgment, written in the age of Moses, some of them by Moses, and were compiled at some period between Joshua and Samuel. Eichhorn thought that in twenty years his theory would meet general acceptance. It has been so overlaid that he would not recognize it.

Voltaire's Assertions.

Voltaire (which was not his real name), born in Paris in 1694, was incarcerated in the Bastille, exiled for supposed anonymous libels on the king, and died in Paris in 1778. His name is unanimously omitted by historians of the critical theories, yet he anticipated nearly all that is advocated today, though not in its modern form. He was a deist, yet he never formally left the Catholic church; on the contrary, he built a church in Ferney, placing in it a relic which he obtained from the pope. The inscription reads: "Deo erexit Voltaire." He hated the Jesuits, and in England was the boon companion of Lord Bolingbroke and other deists.

In the Philosophical Dictionary, Article "Moses", and in his "Miscellanies" in the treatise on Tolerance he asserted:

1. Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch.
 2. The first four books of the Pentateuch were composed by Ezra or some other post-exilic writer.
 3. The book of Joshua had a similar origin.
 4. Deuteronomy was the book that was found in the Temple by Hilkiah.
 5. The first six books were compiled from several documents, written by as many different authors, who made many mistakes and often contradicted each other.
 6. Most of the laws ascribed to Moses did not originate till long after his time.
 7. The law came after the prophets.
 8. The Pentateuchal laws and worship were the result, not of legislative enactment, nor of divine appointment, but of gradual development and growth.
 9. The Mosaic tabernacle never existed.
 10. The historical books are legendary and untrustworthy.
 11. Nearly all the Psalms are of post-exilic origin. But few are from David.
 12. Solomon was not the author of the Song of Songs, nor of Ecclesiastes, nor was Isaiah of the last twenty-seven chapters of his prophecy nor of all the preceding thirty-nine.
 13. The Scriptures abound in anachronisms, contradictions, interpolations, redactions, alterations, and almost all kinds of errors.
 14. Neither the testimony of the apostles nor of Jesus, in regard to the authorship of the books of the Old Testament, is to be accepted as trustworthy.*
- Voltaire is not followed in his denial of the existence of Moses, but he is the father of all those who claim that all scholarship nods approval to their opinions.

Karl David Ilgen (1683-1834) found seventeen documents, the work of three writers.

*Quoted by Prof. McDill, Xenia, O. *The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch*, p. 65.

**Fragmentary
Theory.**

In Great Britain a Roman Catholic—Alex. Geddes (1738–1802)—propounded the fragmentary theory. It had the Pentateuch pieced together, not before David, not later than Hezekiah. J. S. Vater introduced it to Germany, but it was short-lived.

**Supplementary
Theory.**

W. M. L. DeWette, an able thinker, added to the literary, the historical criticism. He framed the supplementary theory. By this Genesis was the work of an author who found an Elohist nucleus, and added to it material from other sources which were Jehovistic. It was accepted by Von Bohlen, Bleek, Tuch, Knobel, Stahelin and Lengerke.

G. H. A. Ewald was a genius, an acute reasoner, a great linguist, a deep theologian, and a devout man. He was conscious of his ability. He is not easily classed. In his maiden effort in 1823 he sustained DeWette. He afterward found in the Pentateuch a "Book of Origins" written during Solomon's reign. To this was added material from the—

1. Book of the Wars of Jehovah.

2. Biography of Moses.

3. Book of the Covenants, which dated from Samuel's time. This happy combination was enriched by R1 in the 10th century B. C., by R2 in the 8th century, and by R3 a few decades later. Deuteronomy was composed in Manasseh's reign.

**Crystallization
Theory**

Delitzsch called this the Crystallization Hypothesis. Germany did not largely accept it. In England, Perowne and Dean Stanley adopted Ewald's view. It dominates Stanley's History of the Jewish Church.

Hupfeld rediscovered Ilgen's three documents, fused together by a redactor. In 1869 DeWette, in his Introduction to the Old Testament, 8th edition, attached the letters, E1, E2, J and R to the different sources.

**Development
Theory.**

The next and final addition was the evolutionary argument. This is a postulate that the religion of Israel is only a natural religion; that it is devoid of supernatural elements, but was developed entirely by human power and resources. The Spen-

erian theory or evolution is added to Hegel's. William Vatke and Leopold George each presented it in 1835. It fell flat. De Wette said that these young men might be expected to bring it out, as thus only could the circle be completed of all possible hypotheses of the Pentateuch.

Vatke contended that the legislation of the Pentateuch was too elaborate for the religious ideas current in the days of Moses. George placed the whole of the Levitical legislation after the exile, assigning Deuteronomy to the time of Josiah. This is called the Development Theory.

Edward Reuss, of Strasburg, claimed to have taught this theory as early as 1834. It lay dormant till one of his pupils, Heinrich Graf, in 1866 brought it into favor. Abraham Kuenen, of Leyden (1828-1879), adopted the Grafian theory, which he had before contemptuously dismissed, and gave it shape. He taught that Israel developed from polytheism to monotheism and the spiritual conceptions of the prophets. Julius Wellhausen became the ablest protagonist of the new theory. He elaborated it, and rewrote the history of Israel, so that Moses would not recognize it if he were to meet it on Mt. Nebo.

The Gottingen professor combined the philosophy of Vatke with the exegesis of Reuss. His works convinced a large number of scholars, among whom were W. Robertson Smith, T. K. Cheyne, S. R. Driver and C. G. Montefiore in England, and C. H. Toy, C. A. Briggs, H. P. Smith and B. W. Bacon in the United States.

The French school have been unable to secure a special name for their hypothesis. As enunciated by Maurice Vernes, it runs thus: No book of the Old Testament was written before the exile. The Hexateuch, as we have it, was completed about 200 B. C., but it was begun probably two hundred years earlier. The historical books were written between 350 and 250 B. C. The prophetic books were all written between 300 and 200. Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, about 150 B. C.†

D'Israeli said that the Zulus were entitled to the rank of civilization, for they had "worsted one of our bishops in theology and one of our generals in war". It was a question by a Zulu which Bishop

†Biblical Essays, 1891, p. IX. Quoted in Expositor, Vol. 1, No. 1

Colenso could not answer that led him on, from 1862 to 1879, to the attack of the historical accuracy of the Pentateuch.

Dr. Kalisch, in 1867, first presented the Grafian theory, but W. Robertson Smith, an able scholar and a charming man, became the ablest protagonist. His article on the Bible in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* aroused strong opposition, led by Principal Douglas of Glasgow. Prof. Smith answered by *Lectures on the Old Testament in the Jewish Church* and, *Prophets of Israel*. He was charged with heresy. The General Assembly of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland decided in favor of his right to hold such views, under the Westminster Confession of Faith, but removed him from his chair at Aberdeen for the sake of peace. But Prof. A. B. Davidson of Edinburgh was not disturbed, and in 1892, Geo. Adam Smith succeeded Principal Douglas at Glasgow. Both hold to the new hypothesis.

The list of conservative defenders is long. In Germany the early theories were opposed by J. G. Hass, B. Kelle, C. H. Fritsche, J. G. Scheibel, Jahn, Rosenmuller, Herz, Hug, Sack, Pustkuchen, Kanne, C. W. Meyer and Staudlin. Among the conservative efforts of men who were not so strenuous in opposition may be mentioned the earlier work of Ewald, Bertholdt and Herbst.

The later German hypothesis from the time of Vatke and George was met by a number of scholars, among whom we name Ranke, Bruno Bauer, L. Konig, F. C. Movers, Dreschler, B. Welte, A. C. Havernick, Hengstenberg and Keil. These last three exercised more influence outside of Germany, apparently, than within. For a time their work seemed to be under an eclipse, but it has recently revived under Ad Zahn, O. Mauman and Pastor Rupprecht in Germany, and Hoedemaker in Holland.

In England, Bishops Lightfoot and Ellicott were among the strongest minds in theological circles who retained the conservative view. Near in point of scholarship were Bishop Browne of Ely, Dean Alford, Dean Milman, Prof. Westcott, Dr. Pusey, Principals Alfred Cave and Henry Wace, Stanley Leathes, James Robertson, J. J. Lias, A. Blomfield, F. B. Spencer, R. A. Watson, N. L. Walker, Prof. Geo. Rawlinson, Henry C. Rawlinson, Geo. C. M. Douglas, R. B. Girdlestone, Richard Valpy French, F. Watson, J. Sharpe, Alex. Stewart, Robert Sinker, Robert Watts, besides many others.

In America, W. H. Green, E. C. Bissell, Howard Osgood, C. C. M. Mead, W. J. Beecher, G. Vos, T. W. Chambers, M. S. Terry, Professors Gardiner of Middletown, Conn.; Schadde of Capital University, Columbus, O.; Harman of Carlisle, Pa.; Dwinnell, of Pacific Theological Seminary, Oakland, Cali.; Streibert of Gambier, O.; MacDill of the United Presbyterian Theol. Sem., Xenia, O.; J. W. McGarvey and B. C. Deweese of the Bible College, Lexington, Ky.; S. C. Bartlett, ex-president of Dartmouth College; Prof Hemphill of Columbia, S. C.; Prof. Shedd of Union, C. F. Thwing of Adelbert, Howard Crosby, Chancellor of New York University, Pres. McCosh of Princeton are among the educators who have written in defense of the traditional view.

On the other side, America has contributed some strong men. C. A. Briggs of Union, C. H. Toy of Harvard, H. P. Smith of Lane, B. W. Bacon of Yale were early in the field. President Harper and Prof. Willett of the University of Chicago, Profs. Ladd and Curtis of Yale, and S. Ives Curtis of Chicago are among the most able advocates of the view which, for the sake of brevity, we shall designate simply as "the theory". Dr. Briggs, in 1897, counted twenty professors, besides himself, in the United States who had signified acceptance of the new theory.

That the reader may clearly understand the issue, we state the traditional view to be that Moses wrote the Pentateuch; yet glosses have crept into the text (very few), and Moses availed himself of documents in writing the book of Genesis and employed amanuenses.

The theory is more complicated. We quote from two men to whom we are indebted for much of the preceding history.

Prof. Briggs:† "A general agreement as to the following points: *a.* An Elohist writing extending through the Hexateuch, written by a priestly writer, commonly therefore designated by P. *b.* A Jahvistic writing, also extending through the Hexateuch, designated by J. *c.* A second Elohist writing in close connection with the Jahvistic, designated by E. *d.* The Deuteronomic writing, chiefly in Deuteronomy and Joshua, with a few traces in the earlier books, designated by D. *e.* These writings have been compacted by redactors who first combined

**The New Theory
Defined.**

†The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch, pp. 68, 138.

J with E, then JE with D, and at last JED with P. . . . It is necessary to distinguish D1 and D2, J1 and J2, E1 and E2, P1 and P2, and thus the problem of Pentateuchal criticism becomes complex and extremely intricate."

Prof. Zenos says :‡ "This theory, as now accepted by a large number of critics, may be succinctly put as follows : The credible recorded history of Israel dates from the days of Samuel. With this prophet also begins the crystallization also of the religion of Israel into its present form. The process thus begun continues through centuries. The Hexateuch is a composite work whose origin and history may be traced in four distinct stages. (1). A writer designated as J, Jahvist, or Jehovist, or Judean prophetic historian, composed a history of the people of Israel about 800 B. C. (2). A writer designated as E, Elohist, or Ephraimite, prophetic historian, wrote a similar work some fifty years later, or about 750 B. C. These two were used separately for a time, but fused together into JE by a redactor at the end of the seventh century. (3). A writer of a different character wrote a book constituting the main portion of our present Deuteronomy during the reign of Josiah, or shortly before 621 B. C. This writer is designated D. To his work were added an introduction and an appendix, and with these accretions it was united with JE by a second redactor, constituting JED. (4). Contemporaneously with Ezekiel the ritual law began to be reduced to writing. It first appeared in three parallel forms. These were codified by Ezra not very much earlier or later than 444 B. C., and between that date and 280 B. C. it was joined with JED by a final redactor. This general view, always allowing modifications in minor details, was accepted by a large number of European and American scholars, and may be said to be the dominant view at the present time." (1895.)

No emotion ought to enter into this discussion. We are aware that complete exclusion is psychologically impossible; moreover, that Alfred Cave uttered a profound truth when he said that the contests of this day are essentially battles over standpoints.

We would that the reader would be perfectly neutral. Make it wholly an intellectual question and follow the strongest logic. Americans cannot bow to names. No braver words were ever

‡Elements of the Higher Criticism, p. 205.

uttered than, "Athanasius contra mundum". Banished by the Arian court, in danger for fifty years, he heroically said that he would stand against the world in defense of the Divinity of Christ. Not names but reasons we seek; not authority but argument.

There is no room for the assertion, that one who accepts these advanced opinions surrenders the faith in Christ. The lives of devoted and talented men show that this is a mistake.

Dr. Briggs says (Hex. p. 135): "Canon S. R. Driver, in his invaluable work has massed the evidence for the analysis of the Hexateuch from language and style beyond any previous writer. He is not as strong in the historical and theological evidence, though he makes valuable contributions to these departments also."

Of Dr. Driver's work "An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" we have the seventh edition (1898).

Prof. Philip Schaff said of it: "It is the most scholarly and critical work in the English language on the literature of the Old Testament, and fully up to the present state of research in German."

Dr. Lyman Abbott was in such haste to commend it that he did not stop to be accurate in grammatical form: "As a whole, there is probably no book in the English language equal to this 'Introduction' for the student who desires to understand what the modern criticism thinks about the Bible."

The book of Deuteronomy presents a square issue. If the facts presented by the new hypothesis bear out their ascription of this book to a later author, they will have gained a strong vantage ground. If unable to sustain their thesis in that unique portion of the Pentateuch, their labor would be greatly increased in other parts of the law.

Following the investigation of Deuteronomy will be the historical argument, with the archaeological as a supplement. Then the scientific argument will be tested by the axioms of the latest scientific investigation. The reasoning from language naturally follows, as the fullest, and probably the ablest, offered by the development theory. Ethics, religion, prophecy, psychology and art will help to present a varied treatment, show the strength or weakness from different angles of vision. To every mind we hope to suggest something which shall be crucial to that

mind in this investigation. If we have omitted any argument of appreciable weight, on either side, it has not been with intention. To many students, on both sides, we are under obligation for these pages.

CHAPTER V.

THE ARGUMENT FROM DEUTERONOMY.

Since Dr. Briggs gives Dr. Driver the lead, in massing the arguments from language and style, it will be necessary to follow the latter in the linguistic argument, and others in the historical and theological investigation.

Fourteen arguments are stated by Dr. Briggs in his chapter on "The Date of Deuteronomy". This is a wise start. If Deuteronomy be six hundred years later than Moses, then Moses could not have been the author. The statements in Deuteronomy: "And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests, the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel", 31:9; and "When Moses had an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, Moses commanded the Levites which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying: Take this book of the law, and put it by the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee, 31:24-26", would necessarily need a different explanation than that they are historically accurate.

Adding his own comments, Dr. Briggs begins with the arguments of Pref. Riehm of Halle.

Gates in Camp. "He argues (1) that Deuteronomy was not written until some time after the conquest, by the expression 'within thy gates'; the statement 'as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which Yaweh gave unto them'; and the ancient landmarks (19:14). The first and

last are often explained from the prophetic point of view of the Deuteronomic code which looks forward to the prolonged occupation of the Holy Land, and shapes the legislation accordingly. The middle one is explained as a redactor's note of explanation."

Dr. Briggs could have added that "within thy gates", meaning within their borders, is used in the wilderness (Ex. 20:10); the camp is said to have a gate (Ex. 32:26); and Jacob called an open place "the gate of heaven" (Gen. 28:17). The idioms of a language are not to be pressed literally.

Chapter 2:12 is part of a parenthesis; it may have been added at a later time. But 2:24 is the language of Jehovah: "I have given—begin to possess", in reference to the conquests east of the Jordan possessed by the two and a half tribes.

Landmarks. The law against removing a landmark was not new in Moses's day. Job alludes to it; it is also named in Hosea and in Proverbs. Plato, Plutarch and Dionysius mention such laws. Deuteronomy never fails to view the occupation of the land as future. Dr. Briggs quotes further:

King. 2. "The book is pushed down to the reign of Solomon by the law of the king (28:36, compare 17:14-20), and its prohibition of horses and chariots and many wives. We cannot deny to Moses the conception of a future kingdom in Israel. In view of the fact that the Israelites had just come out of bondage to the king of Egypt, and that they were surrounded by nations having kings, it was natural to think of kings for Israel likewise; a king would be the likely thing in the subsequent times after the conquest. If the Deuteronomic code had this ideal, such a law in the code might be regarded as appropriate. The reproof by Samuel of a subsequent desire for a king might be in view of altered circumstances. The nation was not ripe for the kingdom, as the history of Saul clearly indicates".

The Scripture sustains Dr. Briggs. (1 Sam. 7:8) "The Lord said unto Samuel: the people have rejected me that I should not be king over them." The prophetic prevision in Deuteronomy warns and guards against the well-known vices of Oriental monarchs. The conservative could use that for his side, for it

does not mention the great sin of Solomon, viz: idolatry. If it obtained its idea of the vices of monarchs from what Solomon did, surely this would have been as prominent as it is in the history of that king. Dr. Briggs continues:

Judges. 3. "Riehm presses the composition of Deuteronomy down to the time of Jehosaphat, by the law of the supreme judiciary at one place, (Dt. 17:1 seq.) which did not exist till the time of Jehosaphat (2 Chron. 19:8-11).

4. "He presses it down to the time of Hezekiah on account of the one only central altar, which was not realized till the time of Hezekiah, 2 Kings 18:4; 2 Chron. 31:1; Isaiah 37:7. The facts are that the one place of judgment and the one exclusive altar were not realized until the times mentioned, as the ideal of the king was not realized till the Davidic dynasty; but do these facts disprove the promulgation of the Deuteronomic code in the land of Moab? These facts prove the non-observance of the code, the disregard of it, and possibly also ignorance of it. They favor its non-existence, but do not entirely prove it."

Dr. Briggs's argument is sound. Non-observance of a law by no means proves its non-existence. It harmonizes with the theory of non-existence, but it is too sadly prevalent in our day for any one to build on non-observance as definite proof.

The examination of three verses preceding the reference in Chronicles will show that Jehosaphat did not carry out simply the requirement in Deuteronomy. He appointed judges in all the fenced cities in Israel. The passage in Deuteronomy has reference to the supreme judge in Israel. Moses appointed judges early in the desert journey: It is not in evidence that they were entirely abolished before Jehosaphat. Even if they were, their restoration does not touch the question as to whether Deuteronomy was in existence or not.

Altar. The statement that the one exclusive altar was not realized till Hezekiah's day is premature. An instance in Israel's history—so natural, so deeply imbedded in the feelings of the hour as to render violent the assumption that it is untrue—reveals the supremacy of one altar at an early period. It was when the two and a half

tribes were returning, after the conquest, to the east side of the Jordan; they built a huge altar on the Canaan side of the river—"an altar to see to". The nine and a half tribes supposed it was an altar of sacrifice, and they gathered for war. However, they sent ten men—chiefs—under the grandson of Aaron to ask if the builders meant to rebel against God by building a second altar. They declared it was only a memorial altar, and peace reigned. The law in Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy is consistent. God said in the wilderness (Ex. 20:24), "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me". That is not two altars. The promise is, "In every place where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee". But there is no indication that God recorded his name in a number of places at the same time. Israel had nearly a score of encampments. In each one God could be worshipped. The law in Deuteronomy 12, is that after they cross the Jordan, and after God should give them rest from all their enemies, so that they would dwell in safety, then God would choose a place, out of all the tribes, for his habitation. Yet up to that time the law was, as in the desert, and in the days of Joshua, that there would be but one place at a time where the name of God was recorded.

Altars in Many Places

In the stormy time of the Judges there were a few exceptional cases. The tabernacle in the wilderness, Ebal, Shiloh, Bethel, were places at successive times, but never two on the same

day. It is recorded of kings before Hezekiah that they did what was right before God, only the high places were not removed. Where there is no law there is no transgression. Here was transgression. Then the law of Moses existed against offering sacrifice at any place except where God had recorded his name. Hezekiah receives praises because he "kept the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses". 2 Kings 18:6.

In treating the Bible as we treat other books, we must accept its historical statements as true unless disproved. To make a hypothesis, then to pronounce any assertion of the Biblical writers untrue because it does not agree with the hypothesis, then to construct from the imagination a history of Israel, and to prove the hypothesis by that history, may be very pleasant mental exercise, but it lacks historicity, scientific method and permanency. Dr. Briggs says, further:

Ships. 5. "Riehm fixes the composition in the time of Manasseh, and the reign of Psammeticus, on account of the going down to Egypt in ships, Dt. 28:68." Dr. Briggs quotes from archaeology to show that ships were on the Mediterranean from the time of Rameses III. "This was therefore quite possible for Moses to conceive of."

This is as far as Dr. Briggs quotes Prof. Riehm, but it is evident that one or the other stopped too soon.

Debts. The date of Deuteronomy can be pressed down to the time of Nehemiah 10:31. The agreement to forego "the exaction of every debt" (Dt. 15:1-2), which is not found elsewhere in the law, brings the date of the composition of Deuteronomy to the time of this compact.

Tithes. The date is further pushed down to the days of Malachi by the tithes. The other books of the Pentateuch know of the tithe and the tithe of the tithe; but Dt. 14:28 has a second tithe. Malachi also writes of "tithes", which places Deuteronomy in the time of that prophet.

Deuteronomy is pressed down to the time of Matthew by the same invincible logic. Three sentences, each an answer to the temptation of Satan, are also found in Deuteronomy. They indicate "an advanced stage of theological reflection". "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God shall man live," is not found in the prophets; it is so late that it is not expounded until the close of the first century, then by the most spiritual of the apostles. "Could such sublime conceptions have originated in the days of Moses, and then have remained dead for centuries till revived by Jesus and John?" This argument may not need any addition, but if the professor will permit the suggestion, it is more credible that an unknown writer would quote from the great Teacher than that Jesus would quote from an unknown scribe.

A Prophet. The date of Deuteronomy is remorselessly pressed down to Simon Peter (Acts 3:22): Moses indeed said, "A prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you from among your brethren like unto me".

This is the conception of a personal Messiah, which the theory, in its pure form, does not find in the Old Testament. It is distinctively late. It offers the same cogent proof, upon which Prof. Riehm relies, that Deuteronomy was not written till the time of Simon Peter. Only in Deuteronomy 18:15 is that prophecy found. If that be valid reasoning, that anything written in Deuteronomy which is also recorded in a later book, or a custom found later than Moses, but named in Deuteronomy, is proof that Deuteronomy is written at the latter date, then it is incontestable that Deuteronomy was not written till after Jesus taught, and Peter peached. Dr. Briggs next quotes Canon Driver:

6. "The forms of idolatry alluded to, especially
Host of Heaven. the worship of the host of heaven (4:19; 17:3), seem to point to the middle period of the monarchy. It is true, the worship of the moon is ancient, as is attested even by the names of places in Canaan; but in the notices (which are frequent) of idolatrous practices in Judges to Kings, no mention occurs of the host of heaven till the period of the later kings." This confirms the suggestion that Deuteronomy belongs to the date given in the Old Testament, for no country worshipped the sun more assiduously than the Egyptians. Emerging from such associations and in the presence of the Canaanites, Moses would surely be able to foresee the strong temptation which it afterward proved to be to the children of Israel. The phrase "host of heaven" occurs in the account of creation. Job was as old as Moses; he has a beautiful passage (31:26-27), in which he pronounces the worship of the sun or moon to be iniquity.

This argument turns for the conservative. For "the forms of idolatry alluded to" are very ancient, while the forms of idolatry which were made popular by Solomon, and which were anathematized by the prophets are not alluded to by Deut. "For Solomon went after Ashteroth" (1 Ki. 11:5-7). Four gods were named in the context. Ashteroth was first worshipped in the period of the Judges, also in Samuel's day, then by Solomon. Milcom, Chemosh and Moloch were introduced by Solomon. The latter had a strong fascination for the Hebrews, who sacrificed their children in its murderous fires.

The prohibition of the worship of the heavenly bodies names

Egypt in the next verse, but names none of the forms of idolatry which arose under the vicious example of Solomon. Thus the argument is stronger for the opinion that Moses wrote Deuteronomy. Dr. Driver continues :

7. "The influence of Deuteronomy upon subsequent writers is clear and indisputable. It is remarkable, now, that the early prophets—

References. Amos, Hosea, and the undisputed portions of Isaiah—show no certain traces of this influence; Jeremiah exhibits marks of it on nearly every page; Zephaniah and Ezekiel are almost evidently influenced by it. If Deuteronomy were composed in the period between Isaiah and Jeremiah, these facts would be exactly accounted for."

Note A. Suppose that "these facts" are not facts. It is a proposition easily tested. (See Note A).

Results are in contradiction of Dr. Driver's assertion. In Amos, Hosea and the undisputed portions of Isaiah (using Dr. Driver's analysis of Isaiah), there are 882 verses. These contain 75 references to Deuteronomy. That is, in every eleven and four-fifths verses there is one reference to Deuteronomy.

In 2d Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Zephaniah there are 3,212 verses. They contain 222 references. That is, in every fourteen and a half verses there is one reference to Deuteronomy. These facts are precisely opposite to Dr. Driver's hasty and dogmatic assertion. Two results are to be regretted : First, the argument loses more than the omission of this careless statement. Any reader with a good reference Bible can test the affirmation. When he finds it rash and unscholarly he not only drops that argument, but he concludes that the hypothesis which advances such crude assertions, must be devoid of strong proof. Secondly, it compels the strictest examination of all that Dr. Driver (endorsed by Dr. Briggs without testing) may affirm. If this assertion had been found to be cautious and solid, a few tests would have created a confidence in the conservative statements of a talented scholar, and his name would be a synonym for accurate knowledge.

Continuing the quotations from Dr. Driver, says Dr. Briggs :

Teaching. 8. "The prophetic teaching of Deuteronomy: the point of view from which the laws are presented; the principles by which conduct is estimated, presuppose a relatively advanced stage of theological reflection, as they also approximate to what is found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel."

Yes; and in Hosea and Amos and Isaiah also. Also in Joshua, so strong that the hypothesis is obliged to remove Joshua down to a time subsequent to Deuteronomy.

Why should the prophetic teaching of Deuteronomy need a late date? Did not God know as much when he spake to Moses as when he spake to Jeremiah? The point of view from which the laws are presented utterly forbids a later date than Moses. The language, the subtle tone, the atmosphere of Deuteronomy are all with Moses. Then the command to blot out the remembrance of the Amalekites (25:27) could have no significance long after Saul and David had subdued and almost annihilated them.

The Atmosphere. The command to utterly destroy the Hittite, the Amorite, the Canaanite, etc. (20:17) would be singularly out of place in the days of Josiah. They had been ground to powder long before.

Scarcely anything could be more repugnant to an Israelite of Josiah's time than the words, "Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite" (23:7). Edom revolted from Judah when Jehoram was king, and remained the implacable enemy of Judah. The Jewish feeling is expressed in the imprecatory psalm of the return (137). This places Edom among those who rejoiced over the downfall of Jerusalem.

In the same verse there is an admonition, "Thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian", which is another watermark of the age of Moses. In his time there would naturally be that tendency to hate Egypt. The humane and spiritual tone of Deuteronomy deprecates all hatred. But in the days of Isaiah and Jeremiah the tendency was to call in the aid of Egypt against Assyria. Both prophets predict disaster upon such attempt. For an author of that age, between Isaiah and Jeremiah, to introduce a command inculcating a kindly feeling toward Egypt would be as incongruous as a resolution expressing sympathy with the English in the South African war would be in the platform of a

party wishing the Irish vote. The Ammonites and the Moabites are dealt with more tenderly than they would have been by a writer after the misfortunes of Israel caused these ancient enemies to raise their heads.

The Philistines, who were so prominent in later days, are not mentioned in Deuteronomy. The Jebusites, who held Jerusalem till the days of David, are merely named in a list of seven nations. Jerusalem is not once named. The prophecies of evil, the warnings of danger, the curses for disobedience make no mention of the loss of ten tribes. An author of Deuteronomy, writing when that loss was a terrible memory to Judah, would surely have written an epitaph.

To note all the instances where the view-point of the laws and regulations on Deuteronomy are with Moses and the land of Moab would be to transcribe the book.

**Unscientific
Evolution.**

"The principles by which conduct is estimated pre-suppose a relatively advanced stage of theological reflection." This is based on the assumption, openly declared by the men who formed the hypothesis, that the religion of Israel is a purely human production. There is no God, no inspiration, no revelation in it. Certainly the Holy Spirit would not need to have a relatively advanced stage of theological reflection, in order to teach Moses principles by which conduct is to be estimated. That is wholly the postulate of a theory which denied God's hand in the formation of the religion of Israel. According to that unscientific and unhistorical idea of evolution, Israel advanced from fetichism through polytheism to monotheism. Therefore spiritual ideas are of a late date.

Canon Driver is not entitled to this argument. The avowed unbelievers, such as Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen, can use it, for they stand where they can deny any guidance of the Holy Spirit. But our author says: "It was the function of inspiration to guide the individual writer in the choice and disposition of his material, and in his use of it for the inculcation of special lessons." (Pref., p. X). With this inadequate view of inspiration even, the principles by which conduct is estimated could be as high as in Deuteronomy. It is hardly fair for Dr. Driver to surreptitiously insert an argument based on a postulate which he does not accept.

Pillar.

9. "In Dt. 16:22 we read, 'Thou shalt not set thee up a *mazzebah* (obelisk or pillar) which the Lord hateth.' Had Isaiah known of this law he would hardly have adopted the *mazzebah* as a symbol of the conversion of Egypt to the true faith." Isaiah 19:19 says there shall be an altar to the Lord in Egypt, and a pillar in the border to the Lord. A prohibition to the Jews was not a prohibition to the Gentiles. Isaiah certainly knew God's hatred of graven images whether Deuteronomy was before him or not.

When Isaiah wrote, the Egyptian priesthood was in full strength. He uses symbolical language to indicate their fall and the growth of the worship of the true God. About 150 years before Christ, the priest, Onias IV, petitioned the king of Egypt for permission to erect a temple at Leontopolis, on the site of a ruined temple. This was about twenty miles northeast of Memphis. He showed the king the prophecy of Isaiah. In the proclamation the king said: "Since you say that Isaiah so long ago foretold it, we give thee license according to law, that we may not seem to have offended against God."

In the time of Isaiah this would have been incredible. At the border of Egypt, in Alexandria, which was not yet founded in Isaiah's time, first a Jewish synagogue and later a Christian church stood as a pillar unto the Lord. It is probable that Isaiah did not have in mind a literal stone pillar. Formerly Jos. 24:26; 1 Sam. 6:14; 2 Sam. 20:8; 1 Ki. 1:9, 7:21; Hos. 3:4 were quoted in support of this argument, but the conservatives showed how unscholarly and inept such references are until they lie along the receding shore as wrecks of once proud arguments.

Style.

10. "The language and style of Deuteronomy, clear and flowing, free from archaisms, but purer than that of Jeremiah, would suit the same period." Here Canon Driver, as professor of Hebrew in Oxford, ought to be sure of his ground. Moses, when a shepherd, was slow of speech. The change to Deuteronomy seems too great. But men may write fluently who speak with difficulty. There are two men in American history who afford parallels to Moses. They are Washington and Grant. The former never made a speech in the Virginia legislature. Yet when Patrick Henry was asked, on his return home, who was the greatest man

there, he said, "Richard Henry Lee is the greatest orator, but Washington is the greatest man."

Contrast this silence with his address to the troops at Long Island, or with his Farewell Address. General Grant was a silent man, but ex-President Grant made fluent speeches, especially in England. After Moses had been speaking constantly with God for forty years, there is nothing improbable in the supposition that he could write in the free and flowing style of Deuteronomy. Writers have often displayed as great a difference in style.

In saying "free from archaisms" Dr. Driver brings the scholars in pursuit.

Among the numerous words which died out in the Hebrew after Moses, the following are samples. The pronoun (*hu*) is used for both "he" and "she" 195 times in the Pentateuch. Of these thirty-six are in Deuteronomy. After Deuteronomy a different form is used for "she", with only three exceptions. That different form is used in the Pentateuch eleven times, but not one is in Deuteronomy. This puts age on Deuteronomy. The plural pronoun (*el*) "these", found in Genesis, Leviticus and Deuteronomy, appears but twice afterward. There are eight grammatical forms which were outgrown after Deuteronomy was written. In the linguistic argument a number of words are shown which do not appear after the Hexateuch. Of these eighty-five find their burial place in Deuteronomy. So the assertion of no archaisms in Deuteronomy collides with the published researches of Konig, Havernick, Hengstenberg and Kiel in Germany and Canon Spence, Bishop Browne and Canon Girdlestone in England. This leaves Dr. Driver in a more vulnerable position than if he had taken up one of the lists and pointed out defects.

11. This Dr. Briggs takes from *Steuernagel*:
Name. "The use of the divine name *Yahweh*, thy God, so characteristic of the earlier stratum of D (234 times), seems to have been influenced by the usage of Hosea, (*Hosea* 12:10, 13:4, 15:2), and to have originated from the conception of Israel as a son (*Hos.* 11) or wife (*Hos.* 1:3) of *Yahweh*, and of *Yahweh*'s personal love to Israel as a nation conceived in the unity of the relations of sonship and marriage.

The doctrine of the love of Yahweh and his faithfulness, so characteristic of Deuteronomy, seems to have been derived from this prophet of love, whose influence was powerful upon Jeremiah also. It is easy to see the origin of these conceptions in the personal experience of the prophet Hosea. It is not easy to see how such sublime conceptions could have originated in the time of Moses, and then have remained dead for centuries till Hosea revived them."

Taking the last first, this shows that Deuteronomy must have originated in the days of Matthew, Peter and John. For such sublime conceptions could not have remained dead for centuries till Jesus and the fishermen revived them.

Dr. Driver says that Hosea 4:12 implies the existence of a written law. The conservative says "the written law". Only three times is "Jehovah thy God" found in Hosea to 234 in Deuteronomy. That would imply that it was more familiar to the writer of Deuteronomy. There are scarcely any quotations, if any, in Deuteronomy from Hosea, even when counted by those who believe that Hosea was prior, while there are twenty-six from Deuteronomy in Hosea. The relation of God as a Father, Israel as a son, which is cited as proof that Hosea was followed, unfortunately for the argument, does not appear in Deuteronomy. The same criticism applies to marriage. It is in Hosea, but not in Deuteronomy. The nearest approach is 31:6, where it is said that Israel will go a-whoring after other gods, but that crime may be predicated of a daughter. So this argument but strengthens the conservative position. If there be strength in the argument from the use of these words, then it belongs to the side which places Deuteronomy prior to Hosea. The relationship of son and marriage are a later thought than Deuteronomy. They are found in Hosea. That prophet was about 800 to 750 B. C. This puts Deuteronomy back near to Moses. Here Dr. Briggs wisely drops the men whose reasoning is so promptly appropriated, with apparent pleasure, but without thanks, by the conservative, and gives us his own cogitations.

12. "The humanitarianism of Deuteronomy may be best explained from the experience of the troublous times from Hezekiah till Josiah."

Why more then than other troublous times? They had them from Egypt on till Solomon.

The humanitarianism could be improved. In Deuteronomy a city was to be offered death, slavery or tribute. The women and children they were to save for themselves. Of the seven tribes of Canaan they were to save nothing that breathed. If that kind of humanitarianism sprang out of troublous times, the springing we can easily understand, but not the fitness of the word 'humanitarianism'.

In proof Dr. Briggs makes some assertions which he fails to verify. He says that Amos rebuked the oppressor of the poor; that Isaiah defended the fatherless and widow, but no prophet before Jeremiah was concerned about the stranger. Moses was a prophet. He enacted some laws for the benefit of the stranger. No distinction in law was to be made between the stranger and home-born (Ex. 12:49.) This was in reference to the Passover. The stranger was not to be wronged nor oppressed (Ex. 22:21). The gleanings of the harvest and vineyard were to be left for the poor and stranger. The stranger could become rich and buy a poor Hebrew as a slave. (Lev. 25:47).

But is Deuteronomy so considerate of the stranger? "Ye shall not eat anything that dieth of itself; thou mayst give it unto the stranger that is within thy gates that he may eat it; or thou mayst sell it unto a foreigner". (14:21).

To a Hebrew they were not to lend upon interest, but to a stranger they could (23:20). Likewise the exaction of a debt. From a brother they could not, in the year of release, exact a debt, but from a stranger they could (15:3). This is the humanitarianism which is best explained by the troublous times from Hezekiah to Josiah. But their troubles in that period were internal, simply, the shedding of innocent blood by Manasseh. The Assyrian took that king prisoner to Babylon, then afterward released him, and Manasseh reigned in peace over Jerusalem. This was small compared to the cruel oppressions of the Philistines in the days of the Judges. After the secession there was civil war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam all their days. That would be trouble. How slender the argument that because Manasseh did evil, and shed innocent blood, and caused Jerusalem to sin, and there was trouble, therefore Deuteronomy was late. Late because it mentions the enactments of the previous legislation that the stranger shall not be oppressed, and shall be allowed to glean in the fields.

13. "The statement of 2d Kings, 22:3f, is to

Book Found. the effect that a law book was discovered whose laws had for a long time been neglected, and whose commands had been so long disobeyed that the nation was rejected by Yahweh on that account. . . . The laws of this code, whose transgression incurred such a penalty, could not have originated in obscurity, a short time before this reform. They must have been ancient, venerable laws."

Why Dr. Briggs should write that, it is impossible to determine. It is precisely the words of the conservative critic. It would seem that the reasoning for a late date is so inconclusive that by the sheer force of truth on an honest mind Dr. Briggs is wafted into the camp of the old school, at least so far as Deuteronomy is concerned.

14. "It has often been urged that the laws of war (Dt. 20:1-20; 21:10-14) imply the circumstances of the wars under Moses and Joshua. The command to exterminate the Canaanites is certainly ancient; but it is here a qualification of the laws of war given in the previous context in order to justify the historic dealings with the Canaanites (cf. Dt. 7:22; Ex. 22:27-30). These laws in other respects indicate a humanitarian spirit, and an ethical sense, much higher than anything illustrated in the times of the conquest of the land, or in the wars of David and his successors in the monarchy. They are doubtless earlier than Josiah and may have been influenced by Amos 1. The command to exterminate the Amalekites (25:17-19) is an ancient law taken up into the Code, and so indicated by the exhortation to remember (cf. Ex. 17:14-16)."

The people of Josiah's time were not interested in the Canaanites; there was no need to justify the historic dealings. They ceased to be a living question in the time of David. Josiah's people were as far removed from David as we are from the discovery of America.

Instead of Amos 1 influencing Deuteronomy to a humanitarian spirit, Amos 1 is rather to be called vindictive. In spite of the express declarations of Deuteronomy that a city which the Israelites might be able to siege was to be given the choice of slavery or the sword, Dr. Briggs sees a higher humanitarianism and ethical sense in Deuteronomy than in the other books. These regulations are not limited to Canaan. The surround-

ing countries felt the strength of David's sword.

Finally, Dr. Briggs ends where he ought to have begun. "Looking now at Deuteronomy itself, we note its language as to the authorship of its code (31:9-11, 24-26)."

"And Moses wrote *this law* and gave it unto the priests, the sons of Levi, who bear the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, and unto all the elders of Israel; and Moses enjoined them, saying: At the end of seven years, in the festival of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel shall come to appear before the face of Yahweh, thy God, in the place which he will choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their ears."

"And it came to pass, when Moses had finished writing *the words of this law in a book* to their end, Moses enjoined the Levites, the bearers of the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, saying: Take *this book of the law* and put it by the side of the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, your God, and let it be there for a witness against thee."

**Question by
Dr. Briggs.**

"This seems to imply the Mosaic authorship and composition of a code of law, but was that code the Deuteronomic code in its present form"? But "seems to imply" is too weak.

It emphatically declares that Moses wrote this law in a book to the end, and that it was to be laid up beside the ark.

Dr. Briggs admits a Mosaic code underlying Deuteronomy. He regards Deuteronomy as being like John's gospel. The deuteronomist reproduces the discourses of Moses in a free and rhetorical manner.

The Mosaic code was enlarged and modified by several redactors "eventually in the hands of two or more editors, put in its present rhetorical form as a people's law book. Would it be any the less inspired on that account? Were not Josiah, Hilkiah and Jeremiah capable of giving authority to such a law book as a code of divine law essentially Mosaic in its origin"?

Not when they give God as authority and Moses as author; Jeremiah, alone, could speak with authority when he spake authorized by God. No one could be a false prophet and be sanctioned by God. Deuteronomy enjoins that. Not only does it

warn against false prophets; it commands; "Whatsoever thing I command you, that shall ye observe to do; thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it" (12:32).

Deuteronomy adds to the preceding revelation. It declares that it is another covenant besides the one made in Horeb and made by the command of the Lord (29:1).

No weightier words are in the Book than these: "The prophet which shall speak a word presumptuously in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak—that same prophet shall die" (18:20).

Laws. Canon Driver says: "The main part of the book bears the marks of being the work of a single writer." "Deuteronomy conflicts with the legislation of Exodus and Numbers in a manner that would not be credible were the legislator in both, one and the same". (Int. pp. 71-82). The Holy Spirit cannot be supposed to be in conflict with himself. Deuteronomy always gives God as authority for its commands. It enforces them with threats which no one except God could carry out. Its utterances are either true or false. If written in the 7th century B. C., it is the most daring and presumptuous placing of speeches in the mouth of God, as well as in the mouth of Moses, known in history.

The resemblance to John's gospel does not exist. There is no point of analogy.

This is the end of Dr. Briggs's statement. **Deuteronomy by Moses.** Surely he stopped too soon. "These be the words which Moses spake to all Israel, beyond Jordan, in the wilderness", so it begins. Are those words true? Out of 937 verses all but about sixty claim to be the very words uttered by Moses. Thirty-seven times his name appears. He claims divine authority and inspiration. The reasoning of Dr. Briggs seems to be but a zephyr against the Rockies when pitted against these affirmations.

Dr. Driver makes some strong assertions: "In the laws as in the history, Deuteronomy is dependent upon JE. . . . When Deuteronomy was composed, JE and P were not yet united into a single work, and JE alone formed the basis of Deuteronomy." (Int., p. 81.)

According to the theory P was not written till 200 years after Deuteronomy. Evidently a quotation from P by Deuteronomy would be a miracle. Dr. Driver's analysis gives what P wrote, so we can test the power of D to quote a writer 200 years before he lived.

<i>Deuteronomy</i>	<i>Passages Assigned to P by Driver.</i>
	1:4 refers to.....Gen. 12:7.
Quotes from P.	1:19 refers to.....Nu. 10:12.
	1:23 refers to.....Nu. 13:3.
	1:26 refers to.....Nu. 14:1-2.
	1:28 refers to.....Nu. 13:32 (one-half is P).
	1:37 refers to.....Nu. 27:14.
	1:46 refers to.....Nu. 13:25.
	1:46 refers to.....Nu. 20:1 (one-half is P.)

This is one chapter of Deut. only.....Nu. 20:22.

Taking a more miscellaneous chapter, almost at random, from a desultory examination, we find the learned professor often at fault.

Chapter 12:2 refers to.....	Ex. 34:33,
Verse 3 refers to.....	Numbers 33:52,
Verse 15 refers to.....	Gen. 9:3,
Verse 16 refers to.....	Gen. 9:4,
Verse 16 refers to.....	Lev. 7:26,
Verse 23 refers to.....	Gen. 9:4,
Verse 26 refers to.....	Nu. 5:9-10,
Verse 26 refers to.....	Nu. 18:19,
Verse 27 refers to.....	Lev. 1:5, 9, 13—all P.

Such careless assertions frequently mar the pages of the writers who are so enthusiastic in the defense of a late date for Deuteronomy.

Indeed, Dr. Driver goes so far as to say that "Deuteronomy does not claim to be written by Moses", putting it into italics, as usual. Deuteronomy 31:24 conflicts with this assertion, which we examine elsewhere.

Phrases. We reach the end of the argument for a late date for Deuteronomy when we note forty-one phrases quoted by Dr. Driver as evidence of a different style. They need not detain us long, for Dr. Driver

concedes that the first ten were used by JE. Then why are they lugged in? We find that all the others except Nos. 12, 13, 15, 18, 20, 27, 28, 29, 32, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40 are found elsewhere. These fourteen are legitimate examples of a different style. This is a mere platitude. The able professor labors to prove that the style of Deuteronomy is not like the preceding books. But long before he began every intelligent man knew that Deuteronomy had a style that marked it off from every other book in the Bible. Prof. Mac Dill has found 55 archaisms in "Childe Harold". They are not found in any other of Byron's works, so that the argument which would prove that the writer of Deuteronomy was not the writer of the preceding books would be equally potent to demonstrate that "Childe Harold" was not written by Byron. (See Note B.)

The statement by Dr. Driver that "the Mosaic authorship of Genesis and Numbers cannot be sustained" is faithfully carried out in his analysis. Not a line in the Pentateuch is admitted to have been written within five hundred years of Moses. Hence the expression "essentially Mosaic" or "Mosaic in core and spirit", or "Moses's sentiments", are misleading. There is no way to tell what Moses's spirit, or Moses's core, or his sentiments were. Then how can four to twenty men write in Moses's spirit when they are distinguished from each other so decidedly?

The treatment of the difficulties is not as scholarly and thorough as we naturally expected.

Miracles of Unbelief. Why the unbroken voice of tradition, why the very text, should so strongly assert the Mosaic hand, are not explained. After the alleged time of this address the children of Israel crossed the Jordan, conquered the land, fell into repeated apostasies and consequent captivities, changed from judges to kings and saw the temple supersede the tabernacle. They had a glorious kingdom, then came the separation of the tribes, the long civil wars, the humiliation and deportation of the Ten Tribes, and the impending doom from the terrible foe of the Euphrates. Yet this writer, as if in mockery, names Ebal and Gerizim and omits Jerusalem. He says in regard to the place where God would record his name: "If it be too far for thee", when Judah and Benjamin were like huddled sheep fearing the butcher. This is an intellectual marvel.

Then a moral miracle emerges when Dr. Driver says that Deuteronomy is inspired. As though God would inspire men (for Deuteronomy has several writers) to tell so many unnecessary falsehoods. In the first six verses there are a dozen falsehoods at least. They never cease. This is a moral miracle, if God inspired holy liars.

Accept the alternative, that God had nothing to do with it. Then men have given us the most spiritual book of the law, a book from which Christian centuries can learn; and these are men who manufactured speeches for the Divine Being and claimed his authority. These miracles, (being not alone), make too great a draft on faith.

Prof. Curtiss of Yale rises to explain. He says that as today we hear the cry "Back to Christ," so then it was "Back to Moses". "Today, in going back to Christ to apply his teachings to present needs, we reformulate them indirectly, giving thus laws of Christian conduct" (Biblical World, June 1898). No one pretends to add a book to the New Testament. Suppose one should bring out a book, purporting to give the words that Jesus spoke after he had talked with Moses and Elijah. It would not even receive serious notice. The older critics, such as Gesenius, De Wette, Ewald, and Bleek declared that Deuteronomy was a unit, not patchwork, and was written after the other books of the Pentateuch.

Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen, Cheyne, Driver and Briggs make it a composite, written by P, JE, D and D2 before most of the middle books of the Pentateuch and large portions of Genesis were in existence. Dillman, Riehm, Kittell, Baudissin, Ryssel, and H. L. Strack hold that Deuteronomy is the latest of the parts of the Pentateuch. †

Some critics freely expressed their opinion of the nature of Deuteronomy, Colenso said it was a forgery. W. Robertson Smith called it a legal fiction, Thomas Davidson said it was an innocent deception.

Try these sayings by Deuteronomy. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it" (4:2).

According to the hypothesis, Deuteronomy instituted a central sanctuary which had never been known before, and dated it

†Zenos. Elements, p. 208.

back to Moses. This put innumerable altars into the shade of idolatry, and condemned the honest sacrifice of the majority of Israel. It was a cruel thing for an unauthorized and unknown author to do.

Prof. Cheyne makes God a party to the deception: "To the priests and prophets who loved spiritual religion, God had revealed that now was the time to take a bold step forward and to accomplish the work which the noblest servants of Jehovah had so long desired." "To ancient laws adapted to present purposes" they added "perfectly new ones framed in the spirit of Moses. . . . It had apparently been placed in a repository beside the ark and there . . . Hilkiah professed to Shaphan to have found it. . . . To say that Hilkiah was the 'forger of Deuteronomy', is, of course, a gross misrepresentation of my position."† But Prof. Cheyne neglected to show by whom it was forged. Certainly he does not believe it to be genuine.

Commenting on the vehement emotion of the king, Josiah, and contrasting it with the "imperturbability" of Hilkiah, Shaphan and Huldah, he adds: "The easiest supposition is that these persons had agreed together, unknown to the king, on their course of action."‡

To the student, who wishes to test these theories on Deuteronomy, the best book is Deuteronomy. However the conservative is entitled to a hearing.

**The Traditional
View.**

He will not admit that his position is, that age makes true. He consents to give the titles of his arguments.

1. The statements in the book itself.
2. The exact harmony with the circumstances.
3. The history following. Defection was prophesied. That lies in human nature. The mind outruns the body. The Declaration of Independence asserted freedom for all men, yet the nation continued the slave trade for twenty years, and slavery for seventy-five.
4. The references in every book following Deuteronomy, so numerous in Joshua, that the new school arbitrarily removes it

†Founders of O. T. Criticism, p. 268. Quoted in *Lex, Mosaica*, p. 463.

‡Pounders, p. 267.

six hundred or eight hundred years after the events it records. Joshua has 158 references to Deuteronomy, Judges has 64, 1 Sam. 61, 2 Sam has 30, 1 Ki. has 69, and 2 Ki. has 53; total 435. To ask the conservative to believe that the gay deceiver who palmed off Deuteronomy went through all the historical books and wove in these references to Deuteronomy, is to make a draft on his faith capacity which he can not honor. He insists that faith comes by hearing, and he wishes witnesses who lived nearer the time than the present critics.

5. The laws given concerning the Amalekites, the Canaanites, Edomites, Ammonites and Moabites are distorted and incongruous in Josiah's day. So with the allusions to Egypt, and the caution not to put a foreigner on the throne, nor to fear horses and chariots in war. Horses and chariots had been known for centuries in Josiah's day.

6. The overwhelming number of unnecessary falsehoods, the fearful imprecations on the man who would do what the alleged D was doing, negatives the supposition of a late author. The forgery of books was of later birth.

7. The omissions are fatal to the theory. For an author to be unaffected by 800 years of deep, stirring, national history and the impending doom of the holy city is incredible. Zion, Jerusalem, so precious to the Hebrew heart, with its sad captivity, prophesied in the reign of Manasseh, are not once named by the writer. The glory of Solomon's reign, its special sins, the Temple which was the pride of the Jews: the Philistines who were so long a thorn in the side of the tribes, the dreaded Assyrians who had taken away ten tribes,—not one of them is named.

Would it be possible for a writer to write in 621 B. C. and mention the Amalekites who had so long passed from the ordinary memory of the people, and never give a hint of the secession of ten tribes, their stormy history and hopeless destruction?

8. There are two names of God which would have been very appropriate in certain portions of Deuteronomy. These are "The Lord of Hosts" and the "Holy One of Israel". Other phrases can be quoted, used before Josiah's day, which would have fitted the style of Deuteronomy. None is used.

9. No preeminence is assigned to Judah. David's sons had occupied the throne for four centuries, yet there is no intimation of such coming honor.

10. The book found lends strength to the idea that it was the autograph of Moses. Papyri have been read in Egypt lately, that are 2500 years old. Josiah obeyed Lev. 26:9, 15, 25, 42, 44, 45; Ex. 33:24, 33, and 34:12, 17. Numbers 33:51, 52. Molech, which was such fascination to Israel, is named in Lev. 18:21, 20:2, 5. It is not in Deuteronomy but it is in the list of idols that Josiah destroyed. He found his authority for putting down witchcraft in Lev. 19:31, 20:6, 27.

11. The archaisms. Deuteronomy is the final resting place for scores of Hebrew words.

12. Style. The pathetic appeal is the language of the heart. The piety, the love for the people, the deep spiritual tone, the sadness and earnestness of the old man eloquent, these can not be counterfeited. The firm grasp of history, the eagle view of the future, the impassioned song, the deep, fervent patriotism, the exalted legislation, the unfailing reverence for God, these are not the footprints of a forger of a revelation.

The difference in the massiveness of the arguments of the two schools is painfully prominent. All the arguments of the new school seem like zephyrs compared with the Himalayas. "Moses wrote this law" is Pike's Peak beside "Isaiah would hardly have spoken of a pillar as the symbol of Egypt's conversion if Deuteronomy had been before him". The suppositions that all pillars were abominable to God, that Egypt would make no mistake in worship, that the Gentiles were to be under the Mosaic law, that Isaiah would not have any poetic license, are all assumed in that argument. Nebuchadnezzar exalted the God of Israel by a proclamation, but he did not dethrone any of the old gods; Rome was willing to put the statue of Christ in a niche in the Pantheon; Athens had an altar to God; so Egypt erected an altar to the true God while idols swarmed in the land.

Then a style of reasoning which is so tenuous that it easily reaches to Malachi and to Peter, really is a trend against the theory. For men reason that if there are strong arguments the new school ought to present them, and not dally with insignificant matters so far removed from the field of battle.

Why did men forge a book of law on Moses? The new analysis finds not a line written by him, so that all the Pentateuch arose after 860 B. C. Why should any man, then, go back to fasten a law on Moses, who left no literary remains, and was 800

years away? How could the writer expect to obtain credence for that work when Moses had no authority. Why was it so promptly accepted?

With such light fencing there is no overthrow of Moses. The word says he wrote the law. Some testimony that he did not, or some evidence that bears on the question; some facts which are irreconcilable with the Mosaic origin are essential, not such airy suppositions as that the allusion to nature worship, or to ships, or to silver and gold, is to be considered an argument against Mosaic authorship.

Perhaps the selection of Deuteronomy, in the beginning of the investigation, was taking the new theory at a disadvantage. It prides itself on its historical and scientific methods. To these we turn, convinced that the theory which is historical and scientific has a future.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ARGUMENT FROM HISTORY.

History Reveals God.

Three voices reveal God, viz: Nature, the Bible, and History. That God has inspired American history is not questioned by the intelligent American. That He led Israel is the postulate of every Christian scholar. History needs an interpreter. It may be put in a vise and compelled to utter an unnatural tone. This is not to read history, it is to strangle it.

Jewish history is unique among the nations. The Jew alone can trace his blood back to Adam. For long centuries that history has no companion. It gives minute details, and orderly sequence of events, happening to the ancestors of the Jew 1500 years before the "Father of History", Herodotus, was born. When archæology speaks it confirms the biblical history.

Carlyle testifies that mankind has always been truthful. No special favor is asked for the Bible when the claim is made that an ancient historian is to be accepted unless testimony exists proving inaccuracy. External testimony, testifying to mistakes and falsehood in the Jewish annals, does not exist. No critic makes such claim. Internal testimony, to be valid, must prove either that assertions made by one writer are contradicted by another, or the history must bear on its face evidence of superstitions, fables, legends or manufactured material. Dr. Edward Meyer is a distinguished German historian. He is of the radical school, believing that the religion of Israel was a natural development. Yet he holds to these axioms in the interpretation of history. In his "Origin of Judaism" he writes of the method adopted by some of his countrymen of formulating a theory and

condemning the documents if they do not agree. "This," says he, "is a very hazardous proceeding on the part of a historian. For a document is, if genuine, a witness which defies contradiction; should there arise a contradiction between a document and other historical narrative, the latter must give way." "It matters not how ingenious a historical theory may be, it must collapse irretrievably if it is found to be in contradiction with a genuine document."

A theory, to be historical, must be in exact harmony with the record, if it clash with the history, the only hope would be to show that the record is false. That would be a useless proceeding in the case under consideration, for if the Old Testament is an untrustworthy mass of legends and manufactured records, it and all theories go down in a common ruin. No sensible man would give such a record more attention than he does to the mythology of Egypt. It would interest the antiquarian, or the student of folk lore, but not mankind. What interest could attach to the investigation of a collection of untruthful statements? No lesson of God's dealings, or of the character of the Ruler of nations, could be derived from a record honeycombed with the imaginations of unknown and irresponsible men.

Moreover, the New Testament makes itself **The New Testament** sponsor for the Old. Writing of the history of **Goes With the Old.** the Jews, the apostle Paul says: "Now these things happened to them by way of example, and they were written for our admonition" (1 Cor. 10:11.) "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning that through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, we might have hope" (Rom. 15:4. This is equivalent to an affirmation that God superintended the writing of that history. If an effort to break the integrity of the history were successful, it would pull the New Testament down from the azure to the mire. In turning to the history we summon a sturdy witness. Have men misunderstood that voice? They did the testimony in the chapter on creation, when they thought that the world was made in one hundred and forty four hours. External evidence changed that interpretation. The traditional theory rests calmly on the history. It claims to be so closely identified that it can be fairly called the theory of all the biblical writers, in both Testaments.

It asserts that which it reads, "Moses wrote this law", and defies any opposing theory to bring forward one unquestionable fact in support of the proposition., that "Moses did not write this law". Thus the traditional theory states its argument from history in a few words. It relies on the axioms which must rule in the interpretation of history and on the unbroken testimony. It must not be forgotten, that throughout the Bible the law of Moses is a unit. This fact must be respected.

The division into five books was unknown to any Jew from Moses to Malachi. It was made by uninspired men. "Genesis" is so called by Gentiles. So with all the others. We read now of "Deuteronomy" as if Moses knew of a division between it and the preceding books. In his hands and in the hands of Ezra the law was one. The language from which the word "Deuteronomy" comes was not born for five centuries after Moses died.

Exodus begins with a connective particle, and in six verses links itself to the preceding. So the succeeding books are cemented together. In the middle books we are informed 137 times that God spoke unto Moses. These are 137 facts, or 137 fictions. From Ex. 17:14, 24:4, Nu. 33:2, Deut. 5:31, 31:9, 22:26, Jos. 1:7-8, 8:31 we learn that God gave Moses the Ten Commandments, and statutes and judgments, and that Moses wrote all the words of Jehovah, the memorial against Amalek, his song and the law, as well as the journeys of the children of Israel. What is left for any other scribe? Viewing Genesis as the natural introduction to the law, we have an assertion that the Pentateuch is the work of Moses.

The early books of the Bible form a closely-linked chain. Exodus begins with "and", and it clasps Genesis in the first six verses. Every book, except Deuteronomy, up to the exile, in the Hebrew, begins with the connective particle.

Exodus refers to Genesis 98 times.

Leviticus refers to Genesis and Exodus 184 times.

Numbers refers to the three preceding books 462 times.

Deuteronomy contains 421 references to the four prior books.

Joshua bears abundant testimony to the facts recorded in the

Pentateuch, and that Moses gave a written law. The first twelve chapters contain the account of the conquest, and the next twelve describe the allotment. The variety of theme, the freedom, the close specifications, the points of direction, the geographical allusions, carry conviction that we read the words of an eye-witness.

Slight indications are weighty. "Jericho" is found eleven times in the Pentateuch, always spelled in a certain way. In Joshua it is found fourteen times and always spelled in a different way. In explanation of this, the theory which makes the forger of Deuteronomy to be the writer of Joshua, or who puts Joshua after the finding of the law in the temple, is speechless. The truth evidently is that the Pentateuch was written before Israel crossed into the land. There they heard a more accurate pronunciation of the word, and the manuscript shows the water marks which a destructive criticism can neither erase nor explain.

Joshua refers to the Pentateuch 429 times.

Judges refers to it 221 times, besides numerous references to Joshua.

Ruth refers to the Pentateuch 26 times.

1 and 2 Samuel contain 369 references to the Pentateuch.

1 and 2 Kings refer to it 379 times.

The Chronicles are so full of references that W. Robertson Smith naively admits that the chronicler teaches that the institutions of the law existed before the exile.

On the request of the gifted Bishop Lightfoot, Prof. Stanley Leathes examined closely the prophets before the exile. If the theory were true that these prophets spoke when as yet the law was not given, they could not quote from or refer to it.

Dr. Driver asserts that no traces of the influences of Deuteronomy can be found before Jeremiah. *What date 6276 577 BC*

In the appendix (Notes A and H) this is shown to be a hasty conclusion. Note A. shows the references to Deuteronomy alone, while under Note H the results of Stanley Leathes's investigations are found. There will be found after Deuteronomy and before the captivity of Judah 2062 allusions to, or implications of, the law. This makes the Scriptures vocal in protest.

Moreover, the chief ordinances of the law are named in a way

that includes all. In 1 Kings, 3 to 8, the building of Solomon's temple is recorded. There are institutions, and the ritual of priests, which the new school dates 500 years later. The history of that day names: "Statutes, commandments, judgments and testimonies written in the law of Moses." What more does the scholar find to-day?

At the dedication of the temple of Solomon a

Temple Utensils. number of the articles of furniture are named. There are:

The Tent of meeting,
 The Ark of the Covenant,
 The altar, and sacrifices beyond number,
 Burnt offerings and Peace offerings,
 The House of the Lord,
 The most Holy place,
 The Cherubim,
 The two tables of the law which Moses placed in the ark,
 The holy vessels,
 Golden altar of incense,
 Table for the Shew bread,
 Golden candlestick,
 Tongs, lamps, flowers, cups, snuffers, basins, spoons, firepans
 all of pure gold.

This does not exhaust the historical argument for the traditional side, but it presents it fairly, so that the reader can judge of the force of the arguments used to prove that that Moses did not write the law. The new critics are not agreed. That can hardly be expected. In a work of destruction (and destruction is sometimes divine) men do disagree, but unless that disagreement is deep, in numerous directions, and on vital points, it is not sufficient to nullify the force of the argument wherein they are in harmony. There has come to the critics who are convinced that Moses did not write a line of the Pentateuch two methods of procedure. One is to deny the validity of the biblical history. This class realize that the twenty-four times that the law is named in the (latter books) (quoted by Dr. Briggs, Hexateuch, pp. 21, 22) the 137 reiterations that God spake to Moses, the 2062 references to the law in pre-exilic writings, and the mournful (because total) silence of the history in regard to

any other author, are all in irreconcilable antagonism to their theory. Voltaire, Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen boldly, attempt to tear the history to pieces. American critics decline to take that course. They endeavor to reconcile the history with the theory. The English critics, who follow the lead of the new theory, are generally between the German and the American. Sometimes they deny the truthfulness of the record, again they contend that there were merely rhetorical modifications of the law made by later hands. The American school usually upholds the record. It contends for emendations and additions. The nucleus is Mosaic. Others endeavored to write in his spirit and to embody his sentiment. This is nebulous. The least change in a law would justify the saying that the law was modified after it left the hand of Moses. Thus David changed the age when the priest could enter upon his duties. Ezra changed the half-shekel tax to one-third on account of the poverty of the people. Happily for the clarity of the issue these modifications are not in question. The hinge is whether Moses wrote the law or not.

In the presence of the bolder critics we hear Voltaire declaring that Moses never lived, and Wellhausen and Stade affirming that he could not write.

Data.

Dr. Kuenen nobly says: "The critic has no other Bible than the public possesses. He does not profess to have any additional documents, inaccessible to the laity, nor does he profess to find anything in the Bible that the ordinary reader cannot see. Rarely is the critic under the necessity of changing the translation."

The Professor gives his opinion of the Mosaic dispensation. He was handicapped by a prejudgment.

"Our standpoint is sketched in a single stroke, as it were, by the manner in which this work sees the light. It does not stand entirely alone, but is one of a number of 'the principal religions'. For us, the Israelitish is one of these religions—nothing less, but also nothing more." (Religion of Israel Vol. 1, p. 5). He says these writers "fearlessly allowed themselves to be guided in these statements by the wants of the present and the requirements of the future. They considered themselves exempt from responsibility." (p. 22).

"The contrast between the Book of Origins and the Yahwistic narratives comes out with ever-growing distinctness. The latter are legends worked up in the prophetic spirit; the former have left traditions far behind, and gives us instead the offspring of the fancy, or, more often, the postulates of the dogmatic system of their author." (Hexateuch Int., p. 27).

Dr. Kuenen, after saying that the critic has no other data than has the ordinary scholar, says
Theory Contradicts History. of the critic of his school, "Yet he dares to form a conception of Israel's religious development totally different from that which, as any one may see, is set forth in the Old Testament, and to sketch the primitive Christianity in lines which even the acutest reader can not recognize in the New."[†]

Evidently, Dr. Kuenen did not believe the historical books of the Bible to be trustworthy.
Theory Contradicts History. President S. C. Bartlett took the pains to collate the phrases which Dr. Kuenen applies to the Scriptures in his work on the Hexateuch. This work is lauded by every staunch disciple of the new theory. These hard names are applied to the Hexateuch: "Glosses, interpolations, insertions, additions", eighty-six times; "amplifications, redactions, corrections, expansions, supplements, alterations, remodelings", twenty-nine times; "later strata, another hand, other hands, foreign elements, another source, later origin", thirty-four times; "unhistorical, fiction, fictitious, absurd, impossible" (or equivalent terms), twenty-two times; "recast, retouched, worked over", twenty times; "manipulated, corrupt, harmonizing artifice, patchwork, literary artifices, tacked on", fifteen times; "fused, welded, amalgamated, combined, compiled, incorporated, remodeled", sixteen times.

Besides, there are other similar terms; a free use of "contradictions", and "the redaction was a long and tedious process". Even this does not fully express the violence done to the venerable documents. President Bartlett quotes such terms as these: "Subsequently filled and expanded"; "gradually elaborated"; "product of continuous redaction"; "gradually accumulated";

[†]Modern Review, July, 1880, Quoted by Prof. Robertson: Early Religion of Israel, p. 43.

"later expansions have successively arisen"; "successive filling in and expansion"; "the result of imitation"; "largely remodeled and further altered when fused"; "stories have passed through many phases"; "have undergone more than one recension"; "indications of various accounts"; "several successive recensions and not much of the original narrative remaining"; "drastic recension, completely recast"; "drastic treatment"; "imitated him"; "collection brought together by redactor who fitted it into a "frame work of his own"; "put together and worked up and certain foreign elements afterwards inserted"; "underwent a rather complicated literary process of which we know nothing"; "several hands at work on the same lines, the editor running them in his own mold"; "a compound narrative"; "diversity of sources"; "interpolated and recast again and again"; "an absolute unhistorical invention framed to defend the doctrine of a unique sanctuary"; "additions to bring the account into a semblance of agreement with the current belief"; "purposely altered to bring it into harmony"; and so ad libitum. Fully three hundred such phrases can be counted.

We would fail to give credit to the critical acumen of Prof. Kuenen, if we did not quote his brief and forcible classification of men of his own school who vary in some degree from him. Riehm, Noldeke, Colenso, Kayser, Juelicher, Hollenburg, Knobel, Schrader, Bredenkamp, Maybaum, and others come in for snap judgment. "Weak"; "unsatisfactory"; "grossly improbable"; "inadmissible"; "anything but conclusive"; "have no weight"; "intrinsically improbable and destitute of proof"; "harmonizing shifts"; "without foundation"; "arbitrary analysis"; "manufacture of a law to meet the demand"; "nothing short of absurd"; "the sorriest shifts". Occasionally he sweeps three of them into the waste-basket at once, as Bredenkamp, Delitzsch and Curtiss, (p. 294); Dillman, Knobel and Juelicher (p. 152); Wellhausen, Juelicher and Dillman (p. 157); Knobel, Schrader and Colenso (p. 163). Of Wellhausen he says his reasoning is doubtful, and he "can make a weak argument".†

†Quoted by Bartlett: *Veracity of the Hexateuch*, p. 307.

From Wellhausen's Prolegomena, pp. 172-283,
Epithets for Argument. we choose some typical assertions. "In Judges, Samuel, and Kings even, we are not presented with tradition merely in its original condition.

Already it is overgrown with later accretions."

"The old arena of tradition has finally been uniformly covered with an alluvial deposit."

"One might as well try to hear the grass growing as attempt to derive from such a source as this a historical knowledge of the conditions of ancient Israel."

"We know that this clerical tribe (Levi) is an artificial production."

"There is not a word of truth in the entire story." (Comment on 1 Sam. 15th).

"It is certain that quite as many (elements of tradition) have been simply invented."

"The history has suffered at the hands of the reviser, by positive meddling with the materials as found in the sources."

"Shiloh had no existence. It was the culminating fraud of our pious historian."

"The most unblushing example of this kind, a piece which for historical worthlessness may compare with Judges 19-21, or 1 Sam. 7 seq, or even stands a step lower, is 1 Kings 13."

Such excerpts could be quoted at much greater length, but these are sufficient to show how Wellhausen could write out a romance and facetiously call it, "The History of Israel". An author who can rewrite the facts of history, 3500 years after they are recorded by men who knew, and who, in some cases, helped to make the history, is able to say of the ancient record which contradicts his theory, "There is not a word of truth in the whole story". (Wellhausen: Hist. of Israel, p. 128).

The explicit declaration, "They forsook the Lord God of their fathers and followed other gods", he pronounces a later insertion. He has no other source of information than the Bible.

The choice offered to the reader is very clear. It is between the veracity of the ancient records and the opinion of the modern scholar: for these able critics offer no stronger evidence that the annals are untrue than their judgment. Is not this the murder of the witnesses?

Prof. C. H. Toy of Harvard, in "Modern Biblical Criticism", p. 911, referring to the account in Joshua and Judges says: "This story, which violates all historical probability, must be rejected. The march from Egypt through the wilderness and the exploits of Moses and Joshua must be regarded as a mass of legend. . . . This reasoning applies with still greater force to the stories of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph, in Genesis. The ancestors of Ehud, Gideon and Jephthah could not have led such lives. The biographies are beautiful legends, with here and there vague reminiscences of events of the time of the judges and later." "The first great book—Deuteronomy—appears under Joshua, . . . Ezekiel and others develop the ritual. A century or two later, the Levitical law is introduced into Palestine by Ezra. The book of Chronicles was written several centuries after the exile."

Prof. Chas. M. C. Torrey of Andover says: "No fact of Old Testament criticism is more firmly established than this, that the chronicler, as a historian, is thoroughly untrustworthy. He distorts facts deliberately and habitually; invents chapter after chapter with the greatest freedom; and, what is most dangerous of all, his history is not for its own sake, but in the interest of an extremely one-sided theory."

If these representations are true, the occupation of these gentlemen is gone. The practical sense of mankind will never invest money to endow chairs to study worthless historical records. Nor will brainy young men devote their time to the study of such trash. The men who originated, perfected, and polished the theory are, or were, unbelievers. They had an interest in establishing the vulnerability of the foundation of the Christian religion. But unbelief has a slim pocketbook. It has never endowed a chair of theology.

The more moderate advocates certainly have a much brighter prospect of having their views accepted. To only one man in a thousand, if so many, can the extreme and violent characterization of the record appeal. But the more sensible presentation is worthy of attention.

The gifted and lamented W. Robertson Smith **Bold in Assertion.** wrote: "The discrepancy between the traditional view of the Pentateuch and the plain statements of the historical books and the prophets is so marked and so fundamental that it can be made clear to every reader of the Scriptures."

This is courageous. If it be carried out in the same bold manner, it will establish the historicity of the new theory.

Making Ancient History. Suppose a man were to tell you that he had a calendar at home in which there were no thirteens. You would be surprised, no doubt, but when he would show you a calendar with all the thirteens cut out, he would make it clear. So with Robertson Smith. He first cuts out Joshua.. "I exclude the book of Joshua because it, in all its parts, hangs closely together with the Pentateuch." Certainly. Joshua was the companion, friend and successor of Moses. From him he received the law, and ever revered his authority. He also cuts out the entire Pentateuch. It bears abundant testimony to its origin. It is a book of history as well as law, and if it is to be cut out, the strongest witness the conservative has is throttled. But innocent W. Robertson Smith could not avoid telling why it was done:

"The tendency of the chronicler to assume that the institutions of his own age existed under the old kingdom makes his narrative useless for the purpose now in hand."

This naive confession explains it all. There is a purpose in examining witnesses, and those who are decidedly against the purpose are taken out and killed. But the other witnesses do not speak to suit him.

"In the time of Judges the religious condition was one of anarchy. Gideon, Jephthah, Samson are as far from the Pentateuchal standard of righteousness as the masses of the people."

It is not a question whether the traditional view can be shown to be unsustained by the historical and prophetic books. Dr. Smith can not bring a single witness into court. Nowhere in the entire book is one who intimates that the traditional theory is discrepant with the records. He even lauds the completeness of

*O. T. in the Jewish Church, p. 233.

the law and says that it is perfectly consistent and logical to hold that it was given at Sinai. He goes further and says that "we have almost no help for the study of Hebrew antiquity beyond the books which were received into the Jewish canon."† Then why does he reject their plain testimony? Simply because away over in Samuel he claims to find a silence about some portions of the law and a violation of it by good men. Neither of these forms a positive argument. If they were indisputable they would do no more than clear the ground. But the silence is denied and the violation is accounted for fully. So that the gifted protagonist really did nothing to redeem his brave promise to make the discrepancy clear to every reader.

Dr. Briggs represents the more moderate school. **Fairness of Dr. Briggs.** His course differs from that of the others. He expressly repudiates the denial of the truthfulness of the sacred writers. "And yet, some of the most essential things of the priest-code are mentioned by the chronicler. These can not be explained by the theory of the school of Reuss. The way in which Kuenen and Wellhausen meet the difficulty is hardly creditable to their fairness and good judgment. We can not consent to the denial of the historical sense of the chronicler for the sake of any theory". (Hex.p. 115). As a courteous scholar and a Christian, Dr. Driver does not indulge in scurrilous epithets. Writing of the historical books of the Old Testament, he lays down what he calls principles, which are really facts or fiction.

1. "In many parts of these books we have before us *traditions* in which the original representation has been insensibly modified, and sometimes, (especially in the later books), colored by the associations of the age in which the author recording it lived. 2. Some freedom was used by ancient historians in placing speeches in the mouths of historical characters" (Preface to Int. to Literature of the O. T., p. 11). These are very important if true. As there is no other literature throwing light on the subject, we are at a loss to know how Dr. Driver attained this knowledge. This is an assumption of the entire question.

†O. T. in the Jewish Church; p. 11.

Instead of taking space to prove the propositions on which the Hexateuchal argument depends, he slips them into a foot note to the preface. Then he spends time on tenuous questions which are shadowy and of no possible profit, even if established. The only proof of the first of what he calls "principles" is the assertion of Wellhausen endorsed by Kuenen and accepted by W. R. Smith. Archaeology collides with it strongly.

Prof. Huxley used the second in his contro-
Dr. Driver Borrows versy with Principal Wace over the Gadarene
Fictions swine. He said that Matthew put speeches in the mouth of Jesus.

Dr. Driver's proof is attenuated. Thucydides imagined the speeches his heroes made. It is a rhetorical device also employed by Webster at Bunker-Hill, representing John Adams in the Continental Congress. No one is deceived by such a literary device. But to say, "Thucydides made speeches for his generals, therefore other Greek historians did,

"therefore the Hebrew writers did,

"therefore the biblical writers did,

"therefore it was right", is a wide departure from legitimate reasoning. It was common among the Greeks, alert-minded and free as they were; among the somber and conscientious Hebrews it was scarcely known, certainly not at that period of history.

The Greek language had six grammatical forms for indirect narration. The Hebrews did not possess one. The Hebrew expected to quote a man precisely, or not at all.

The forgery of writings did not arise till writings grew valuable. This was when literature had so far advanced toward a profession that some names gave value to a manuscript. Galen, a very competent witness, says it was not till the age of the Ptolemies, when kings were reviling each other in the collecting of libraries, that the roguery of forged letters and titles began.

That was 600 years later than the last of these historical books. Dr. Driver continues to handle the history freely. He says "P includes elements not, in the ordinary sense of the term,

historical"; "largely recast"; "can hardly have taken place"; "an ideal representation"; "The narrative has been expanded"; "expansion and embellishment."†

**Biblical History
Destroyed.**

If the judgment of Kuenen, Wellhausen, W. R. Smith, C. H. Toy, Chas. M. C. Torrey and S. B. Driver be correct, there is an end to biblical criticism. The practical American has no time to waste over records which are honeycombed with wild and untruthful statements. God reveals himself to man by what He says and by what He does. But if we can not know that the record of His actions, correlated with what men did, is true, we can never know our God. Actions are more emphatic than words. **(If even the speeches put in His mouth were manufactured, it is a miserable waste of time to pore over the early books of the Bible.)**

Suppose we follow Prof. Driver and weigh the **Strangled History.** rich spiritual gold he digs from the mine. (Judges 19 to 21): "The account as we have it can hardly be historical. The figures are incredibly large. Deborah (5:8) places the number of warriors in entire Israel at not more than 40,000; here 400,000 advance against 25,000 plus 700 Benjaminites and the latter slay of the former on the first day 22,000, on the second day 18,000; on these two days not one of the 25,000 plus 700 Benjaminites falls, but on the third day 10,000 Israelites slay 25,100 of them. Secondly, whereas in the rest of the book the tribes are represented uniformly as acting separately, and only combining temporarily and partially, in this narrative Israel is represented as entirely centralized, assembling and taking action as one man, with a unanimity which, in fact, was gained only . . . and then imperfectly . . . after the establishment of the monarchy. . . . The combination can hardly have taken place on the scale depicted. . . . the original narrative has been combined with the additions in such a manner that it can not be disengaged with certainty, and is now, in all probability, as Kuenen observes, not recoverable."‡

If Kuenen's observation does not preclude inquiry, we may

†Introduction, pp. 128, 167, 170.

‡Driver, *Int.*, p. 169 to 176.

note that Deborah does not say what Canon Driver puts into her mouth. He is using freedom in manufacturing speeches for a historical character. In 1 Sam. 13 we learn that Saul and Jonathan were the only men who had swords and spears. In Deborah's time there may have been eight. That would have been one to every 50,000. Hence, in poetical fervor Deborah sings.

"Was there a shield or spear seen

Among forty thousand in Israel?"

Manufactured History. A wooden interpretation makes this to mean that there were only 40,000 soldiers in all Israel, a nation that had 600,000 when they left Egypt, and about as many as when they entered Canaan. The plain statement in Judges 20, that there were 400,000, is set aside by a line of poetry which carries no contradiction.

The record does not say that on the first two days not one of the Benjaminites fell, nor does it say that 10,000 Israelites slew 25,100. It specifies one particular body of Israelitish troops, as it does in v. 16, the seven hundred left-handers of Benjamin. On the contrary, v. 15 gives 26,700 Benjaminites. The slaying of 25,100 is described, and the escape of 600. This leaves 1,100 unaccounted for, who can best be placed among the slain of the first two days.

As to Israel's coming together at the call of the Levite, when he cut up the body of his concubine and sent a piece to each tribe, it is evident that he expected it; that their previous history justified his hope, and the result was the coming together of the tribes. They had repeatedly done so before, and did later. There is no more room for throwing discredit on the record than there would be for doubting the union of the republics of Greece against the Persians.

The Hebrew scribe sometimes repeated an account. The second relation adds details. Such an instance occurs here. The second account begins at Judges 20:36. Dr. Driver takes verses from each account, and causes just twice the number to be slain.

In the same key, "It can hardly be historical", Prof. A. B. Davidson (Expositor for Jan. 1887) says of the book of Judges, "It is hardly strict history, but rather the philosophy of history".

Prof. Curtis of Yale (Biblical World, Jan. 1898) says that "the

slaughter of the Midianites, (Num. 31) without the loss of one Israelite, is only an ideal sketch". For the reason, *i. e.*, the loss of so few on one side, Dr. Driver says that the battle against the Benjamenites is "an ideal representation".

Dr. Abbott says: "If this old record had told the story of a battle between the ships (had they had ships) of Israel, and a pagan nation, and in that battle every ship of the pagans was sunk and not a man of Israel was killed, not a skeptic on the globe but would have pointed the finger of scorn at the narrative, and laughed at the men who had faith in it. But today we read without question that story of an American victory." † Gen. Young in the Philippines, marching to Vigan, found the enemy strongly entrenched and well provided with artillery. The battle lasted five hours, the enemy suffering heavily, while the American casualties were limited to one man seriously wounded.

If a historian were to say of Dewey and Young, "These accounts can hardly be historical", he would follow in the track of the writers of what Prof. Cheyne calls the "disintegrating theory". Surely it is destructive. It turns the simple, sober, often sad, story of the deeply religious Hebrew into a mass of untrustworthy tradition. It leads an able man into such weak and faith-destroying interpretation as Dr. Driver on the war with the Benjamenites.

Our history furnishes other strange coincidences. Jefferson was born eight years after American History John Adams; Madison eight years after Jefferson; Monroe eight years after Madison; J. Q. Adams eight years after Monroe.

John Adams, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe was each 66 years old when he retired from the presidency.

The first three died on the 4th of July. Jefferson and John Adams died on the same 4th of July, just fifty years after 1776. Both had signed the Declaration of Independence. Three thousand years from this time the Dr. Kuenen of that day can say, "This can not be historical". He will have the same basis in fact. All that can be required is the same faculty for drawing illogical conclusions. It may be fairly said that we do not need

†The Life That Really Is, p. 116.

to accept the harsh language of Kuenen and Wellhausen. We answer:

**Theory Finished
by Skeptics.**

1. These men perfected the hypothesis. The Anglo-American has added not an item. Dr. Driver quotes Kuenen and Wellhausen as authority— W. R. Smith gives them a warm letter of recommendation: "Kuenen and Wellhausen are men whose acumen and research have carried the inquiry to a point where nothing of vital importance for the study of Old Testament religion still remains uncertain."†

These men who originated and perfected the theory perceive instantly that historically it collides with the records.

2. W. Robertson Smith, Prof. Cheyne, Dr. Driver (in part of his book), Prof. Toy of Harvard, and Prof. Torrey of Andover, represent a wing believing in a revelation from God, yet making the records untrustworthy. Apparently they do not perceive that if their judgment be true the ground for biblical investigation is quicksand. Dr. Briggs will furnish an illustration. He tried to form a scheme of biblical theology. He describes P and E, one always using an instrument in working miracles; the other, not. When his references are consulted, it is found that what was P or E or JE when he wrote, has sifted to some other letter, and his generalizations are worthless. Even Dr. Driver, in commenting on the characteristics of some letters, confidently, even rashly, ventures to refer to passages. In his own analysis, these sometimes fail to agree.

3. The Anglo-American school accepts the analyses and arguments of the extreme wing. The anti-supernaturalism is renounced.

Dr. Briggs says: "We now have accessible to us the analyses of Dillman, of Kuenen, of Wellhausen and of Reuss, of Driver and of Kautzsch, and they are essentially agreed. We defend the historicity of the Hexateuchal narratives and laws against Reuss, Kuenen and Wellhausen."‡

‡Religion of the Semites. Preface.

*Hexateuch, pp. 143, 162.

This may close the first section of the argument from history. The hypothesis will appear in a better light in the next. In this it is evidently a question of stand-points. The Biblical history says one thing; these fearless and talented critics say another. Without doubt or hesitation they say that the testimony of the historians, (except where it coincides with the hypothesis) is unreliable. If the records be traditions, colored and modified, imagined speeches, legal fiction or innocent deception, non-historical exaggeration or embellishment, the preeilic books of the Bible sink to the level of folk lore and are worthless as a vehicle of divine revelation. If so these scholars stand as the oracles who reveal the truth.

Wellhausen and Kittell rewrite the history. They have no data but the Bible and their fancy. They consider the latter the better source.

What Is a Camel? A large reward was once offered for the best conception of a camel. A German, an Englishman and a Frenchman entered into the competition. The Frenchman began to draw and paint his camel, the Englishman started off the next morning to Africa to get one, while the German sat down to evolve it out of his inner consciousness.

This is the autocratic creation of history. Homer, Plato, Cicero, had to pass through the same furnace through which Moses is being pushed. Whether the stern, unflinching records of the men who were eye-witnesses or very near to the events, or the imaginations of learned men who are not in sympathy with the purpose of redemption, are true, is the simple yet vital question to be decided. That method of evolving history from the inner consciousness has never been able to secure a patent in America.

Another phase is presented by Dr. Driver and Dr. Briggs. They concede too much for the health of the theory. Dr. Driver says: "It can not be doubted that Moses was the ultimate founder of both the natural and the religious life of Israel; that he provided his people not only with, at least, the nucleus of a system of civil ordinances, but also with some system of ceremonial observance, designed as the expression and concomitant of the religious and ethical duties involved in the people's rela-

tion to its national God. . . . It is further in analogy with ancient customs to suppose that some form of priesthood would be established by Moses; that this priesthood would be hereditary; and that the priesthood would also inherit from their founder some traditionary lore on matters of ceremonial observance."[‡]

Concessions. Dr. Driver finds the Tabernacle, the Ark, Aaron at the head of the priesthood, and the tribe of Levi set apart for priestly functions.

"Fresh definitions and distinctions would be introduced, more precise rules would be prescribed for the method of sacrifice, for the ritual to be observed by the priests, the dues which they were authorized to receive from the people, and other similar matters." "Thus the allusions in Deuteronomy imply the existence of usages beyond those which fall directly within the scope of the book, and belonging especially to the jurisdiction of the priests. (e. g. 17:11, 24:8.)"[†]

The passages to which Dr. Driver refers completely subvert his theory. The first one refers to the enactments in Leviticus and Numbers (15 theory) in regard to civil law. These are said by the analysis of the Pentateuch given by Dr. Driver to have been written by P, two hundred years later than Deuteronomy. His second reference is in regard to the regulations concerning leprosy.[‡] The one verse quoted below is all that Deuteronomy tells the people, but the reference is to two chapters, having fifty-nine and fifty-seven verses (Lev. 13 and 14), where the most minute directions are given in regard to the treatment of that fell disease. These chapters in Leviticus are assigned to P.

Fraud Felt A man brought an ancient manuscript to the British Museum. It was valuable find of a work known to have been written by an ancient author, but of which no copy has come down to us. The librarian rubbed the paper between his thumb and finger and refused to read it, or to buy it at any price. The paper was modern; the librarian was an expert. So these verses are the touch of the ex-

[‡]Introduction, pp. 152-3.

[†]Driver's Interpretation, pp. 453-4.

[§]"Take heed in the plague of leprosy, that thou observe diligently, and do according to the all that the priests the Levites shall teach you; as I commanded them, so ye shall observe to do."

pert. The theory is as modern as that paper which claimed to be an ancient manuscript. One rub was enough for the librarian. He wasted no more time, he used no arguments. Precisely so; as it was impossible for that ancient author to write on modern paper, so it would have been impossible for D to write a reference to the specific and minute directions concerning the treatment of leprosy if these scientific instructions had been yet two hundred years in the future.

How does Dr. Driver meet this? He adds: "These passages are good evidence that the principal institutions of P are not a creation of the exilic period, but that they existed in Israel in a more rudimentary form from a remote period."

How does he know that they were in a more rudimentary form? There is no historical evidence except the sober, plain, sensible account given in the Bible.

"The chief ceremonial institutions of Israel are, in their origin, of great antiquity; the laws respecting them were gradually developed and elaborated. In the shape in which they are formulated in the Priest's Code they belong to the exilic, or early post-exilic, period."

"It is the system with which they are associated and the principles of which in P they are made more distinctly the expression which bear the marks of a more advanced stage of ceremonial observance."²

Similarly Dr. Briggs, who bravely says, "We cannot consent to the denial of the historical sense of the Chronicles, for the sake of any theory", claims that "The Mosaic legislation was delivered through Moses, the great prophetic law-giver of Israel, and then unfolded in historical usage and interpretation, in a series of codifications by inspired prophets and priests. But it was in several stages of advancement in the historical life and experience of Israel from the conquest to the exile."³

Thus these writers, although they have far more respect for the sacred records than the bolder critics show, stand utterly without support from the history. The search is for historical sanction to a theory. The traditional theory submits its quotations; the extreme critic traduces the accounts; the moderate critic says it was evident that the Mosaic legislation was given

²Introduction, pp. 142, 152.

³Briggs, *Hecateuch*, p. 160.

through Moses and was of great antiquity. These assertions are true, but they surrender the historical argument to the traditionalist. The doctors attempt to save the theory by heroic treatment. They claim that it was given in the desert by Moses but not in the precise form or with principles advanced by P. As to principles, they are simply the work which God had done for Israel. The deliverance from Egypt and the upholding in the desert are the bases laid down for Israel's obedience. As to the rhetorical form, that is pure imagination. If the history is to be respected it must be accepted for what it reveals; if it is to be rejected simply because the theory demands a reconstructed account, the reader is invited to accept the dictum of the modern scholar instead of the testimony of the ancient historian. This is not historical insight; it is, to use a technical phrase, *histodialogy*, the dissolution of history.

The Anglo-American school again endeavor to link their theory to the history by the analogy in the Christian era, when new conceptions are born as the centuries advance. The analogy is exact. God gives a law in a perfect form, the people come to it gradually through millenniums. But we do not frame new gospels or epistles in this day nor is there yet any historical proof that the Jews did with Moses's law. The new school finds codes in the law of Moses which are to their vision strata. Dr. Driver sees three,[†] Dr. Briggs sometimes four, at other seasons five or six.[‡] This is decisive proof that the legal education of the brethren was defective.

What is Codified Law? About twenty-five years ago Ohio appointed a codifying commission. During several years it examined all the statutes adopted by Ohio, either as a territory or as a state, and consolidated all on any one subject. Their results formed a code. It was adopted by the legislature. The state of Pennsylvania has never had a code commission. In litigation, attorneys and judges must go back to Wm. Penn, then follow successive enactments of the legislature to be sure that a statute has not been changed. The Mosaic law was never codified. Laws grew out of the history and the history gave birth to law. There are eleven Sabbath

[†]Driver Introduction, p. 48.

[‡]Briggs Hexateuch, pp. 100, 160 and Index "Code".

laws in the Pentateuch, scattered from Exodus to Deuteronomy. They have never been codified. Hence the disagreement of the critics as to the number. Dr. Briggs has nine in different parts of his hospitable Hexateuch. A legal mind would not be able to see the imaginary lines.

Again Dr. Briggs, writing of the emphatic declarations in Deuteronomy, "Moses finished writing the words of this law in a book to their end", endeavors to break the force of this oracle by saying: "This seems to imply the Mosaic authorship and composition of a code of law, but was that code the Deuteronomic in its present form?" With this agrees Dr. Driver.

"These passages are proof that the institutions in question are ancient in Israel, but not that they were observed *with the precise formalities prescribed in P*; indeed the manner in which they are referred to appears not infrequently to imply that they were much simpler and less systematically organized than is the case in P." (Int., p. 143).

This awards to Moses the giving of the law, the institution of the ceremonial worship, but reserves some details which were added afterward.

1. It is ambiguous. The least change would
Defects in History. justify the assertion. The change in the age when the priests began to serve, the introduction of music and singers, the classification by courses, all by David, would enable the critic to say that the ritual had not the precise formalities it possessed originally.

To P is assigned the portions of Exodus which describes the Tabernacle, all of Leviticus except Chap. 17 to 26, which are called H, and Numbers 1 to 10:28. Generous portions are elsewhere given to P, who has nearly half the Pentateuch, and is supposed to have written during the exile. For the conservative to say that nowhere in this has an interpolation in the precise formalities crept in, is as difficult as for the radical to pick out one and quote any proof that it was unknown to Moses.

2. The statement is not ambiguous when its
Moses Pushed Out. quiet assumptions are considered. These crowd Moses out of the Pentateuch altogether. Not a word do we have written by him. He has no place in Briggs's

index. The earliest writer is E or J, the critics being divided. He wrote not earlier than 900, possibly as late as 750 B. C. Then D in the seventh century and P in the fifth, with a number of redactors between, give the law to Israel and make them believe it was given at Sinai. Not only the hypothesis as they received it, but the exigencies of the argument also, crowd Moses off the platform; for to admit that Moses wrote a line, would be to furnish a standard of the language in his day, which would give opportunity to test the claim for E and D.

For these large assumptions there is no historic proof. The Bible witnesses are in direct antagonism to every affirmation of that hypothesis.

A Contradiction. To maintain the integrity of the history, as Dr. Briggs manfully does, and yet to uphold a theory which is deadly to its claims, is to lead a forlorn hope.

Lack of Argument. Dr. Briggs's first attempt is entitled, "The Testimony of Holy Scripture". He quotes Ex. 24:3-4-7, 34:27; Deut. 5:31, 31:9-26; Josh. 1:7-8, 8:31; Deut. 31:22; Num. 33:2; Ex. 17:14. then says: "We shall now consider some passages of the Hexateuch which tell a different story." These passages tell that Moses wrote the memorial against Amalek in a book, which is evidence that Moses wrote a book. He also wrote the journeys of the Israelites, his song, the book of the law, all the commandments, and the statutes and the judgments, the words of the covenant which God made with Israel, and, in brief, all the words of Jehovah. What was omitted?

Dr. Briggs says that these do not say that he wrote the Pentateuch.

1. "Pentateuch" is a Greek word. It is used in surgery with a different meaning. It was manifestly impossible for that word to appear in the law.

2. The division into five books was made more than a thousand years after the death of Moses. Paul quotes Genesis and calls it the law (Gal. 4:21). Had Moses wished to assert that he wrote the law, what words could he have used other than those he did use? If Dr. Briggs had pointed out something which

Moses did not cover, there would be some ground for his assertion. Here are words concerning Amalek, and Dr. Briggs says explicitly: "It is distinctly stated what Moses was to write, namely, the words, 'I will utterly blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under Heaven.'" Yet the analytical theory says that E wrote these words six hundred years after Moses's death. Will Dr. Briggs find passages in the Hexateuch which tells a different story? Will they say that Moses did not write the law, or that some one else wrote it? If so the Holy Spirit would contradict himself. That would not be proof that D, E, H, or P, Q, R wrote the Pentateuch, but the two assertions would neutralize each other.

Three passages are submitted by the author. Only one is from the Pentateuch. It is Num. 12:14. It is a quotation from the books of the wars of the Lord—merely a list of geographical names. This is Dr. Briggs's entire proof from the Pentateuch that Moses did not write what was ascribed to him, and therefore that the law was written by J, E, P, and others. Perhaps Moses wrote the book of the wars of the Lord. Or he may have quoted from it as from a book of poetry, or it may be an interpolation by a later hand. Dr. Briggs quotes:

"Josh. 24:26. Joshua wrote these words in the book of the law of God."

This may mean that Joshua wrote the book bearing his name, or it may refer to the covenant he made with the people. In either event, it has no intention of telling that Moses did not write the law.

Dr. Briggs then quotes from (10:12, 13), a **A Weak Argument**, strophe cited from the book of Jasher in regard to the sun standing still over Gibeon. He adds: "hTis book seems to have been another collection of poetry. Two other extracts from this book are given in the Old Testament. One is 2 Sam. 1:18, the other, 1 Kings 8:12, 13." The author's reasoning is that if Joshua contains these extracts, then Joshua could not have been earlier than the temple. Then if the book of Joshua be inseparable from the Pentateuch then the Pentateuch must have been compiled after the dedication of Solomon's temple.

This may be met by a parallel case. There is a book entitled "Poetry of the Peers of England." Milton could have quoted

from it in his Samson Agonistes. So could Kipling in any of his writing. In 5000 A. D. a writer could contend that Samson Agonistes was not written till 1900. The argument would be the same as that presented by Dr. Briggs. These are all he offers in support of his promise that we would hear the Hexateuch tell a different story.

Dr. Briggs tries to break the force of Hosea 8:12. "Though I write for him my law in ten thousand precepts, they are counted as a strange thing". The Dr. understands this to mean, "If I were to write my law". Above is the English revised. The American begins, "I wrote for him my law", etc. Hosea, being as early as the first writers of the Bible, according to the hypothesis it is evident that if the American revisers are right, or King James: "I have written for him" etc., then the hypothesis must lead Hosea to the block as W. R. Smith did Joshua and the chronicler. The situation would seem to demand the translation which makes the writing a historical fact. There would be no force in Hosea saying, in the name of the Lord, to the ten tribes, that if he had written them a law they would have counted it a strange thing, *i. e.*, disregarded it till it was unknown. There would be no evidence applicable. Dr. Driver says that this passage implies the existence of written laws about 750 B. C. "Implies" is too feeble. It affirms, if it is not a mere hypothetical assertion.

Jeroboam had set up calves at Dan and Bethel, **History is Irreconcil-** and made priests of those not of the tribe of **able to New Theory.** Levi. If the law was not given till the exile, the tribe of Levi was not set apart. There would be small ground for Hosea's eighty references or allusions to the law. With this verse affirming "my law" incontrovertibly, and with the weight of probability in favor of a charge that the ten tribes had disregarded the written law, the historical argument appears to swing around always toward the traditional view. This would account for the traditional theory. No explanation of the rise of that theory has been offered by its opponents.

To maintain the truthfulness of the development hypothesis and the historical accuracy of the first seventeen books of the Bible is impossible. No new critic, if courageous, fails to attack the veracity of the writers. He may do so indirectly by affirm-

1710
6' 02
7 075
B.C.

ing propositions which involve that conclusion, or he may boldly assert their unreliability. This is not saying that he is necessarily wrong. It is affirming that the first seventeen books of the Bible are in conflict with the new hypothesis of the origin of the Hexateuch. If the books are, as he conceives, made up of legends and of manufactured speeches, then his theory may be true, and if so, it is historical. Our investigation merely declares that the theory can not claim compatibility with the biblical history.

If Dr. Briggs had followed, with Joshua, the line of argument he counted worthy of publication on Deuteronomy, taking it from this end of the history, he would lucidly and invulnerably have stated his affirmations in this order: Joshua was written after Deuteronomy. It presupposes all the history up to the crossings of the Jordan.

Joshua was written before Ezra, for Ai was in ruins when Joshua was written (8:28). It was inhabited in Ezra's day (Ezra 2:28).

Joshua was written before Isaiah, for Ai is then inhabited (Isa. 10:28). Prof. Cheyene admits that "Aiath" is "Ai".

It was written before Solomon, for Canaanites were dwelling in Gaza (Josh. 16:10). But Pharaoh slew the Canaanites in Solomon's time (1 Kings 9:1).

Before David, for the Jebusites were not yet driven out (Jos. 15:63). David conquered them (2 Sam. 5:6-9).

Before Saul, for the Gibeonites were covenanted with to be servants; changed by the time of Saul (2 Sam. 21:1).

Before two centuries had passed, for the stones were yet visible in the midst of the Jordan (4:9) "unto this day". Those stones would be thrown down by the floods and the wearing of the bed of the river in less than a century, probably. The stones over Achan (8:26), and at the mouth of the cave where five kings were buried (10:28), remained until Joshua was written. Before that generation died, for the writer says: "We passed over" (5:1). Rahab was yet alive (6:25). This is a statement of facts, and has that strong advantage over the doctor's argument in favor of a later date for Deuteronomy. The steps of the argument are firm and solid. There is no guess work, no illogical process.

The only way to overcome the testimony is to strangle the witness. Joshua refers to every book of the Pentateuch, to all the supposed writers, and claims to have the book of the law of Moses.

Silence and Violation.

There are two arguments which are strongly relied upon by the new school. They are the arguments from silence and from violation of the precepts of the law by good men.

It is claimed that the historical books are silent concerning some features of the Mosaic law, and that good men, such as Samuel and Gideon, acted as though the law were not in existence. To that extent the argument is valid. That is, if the law was non-existent, some deeds of godly men are accounted for. If they can be accounted for by another hypothesis, the argument loses positive force. The major premise is weak. No one will affirm that silence concerning an event or law or custom, by those who might be expected to speak of it, is actual proof that it did not occur or was non-existent. Dr. Briggs forcibly says that a matter may be beyond the scope of a writer's argument, or he had good and sufficient reasons for omitting it, or he was ignorant, or it did not exist.

The same reasoning applies to non-observance of law. It could be because the law does not exist, but it could be from other causes. Examples we have in the Bible and in other literature. The Day of Atonement is not noticed in the historical books. Every scholar admits its existence in the law after the Return. Silence does not prove non-existence.

The sin-offering is not mentioned after Numbers till the days of Hezekiah. Then after Nehemiah it is not named. It is in Ezekiel. The trespass offering, Dr. Briggs says, is not found in pre-exilic writings. He overlooked 1 Sam. 6:3-4-8-17.

Peace offerings appear after the exile only in an allusion in the book of Proverbs. The Levitical purifications are scarcely named after they were instituted. The beautiful ceremony of the sprinkling of the ashes of a red heifer is not again mentioned till Heb. 9. Dr. Briggs hastily says that the feasts of the Priests' Code do not appear in the pre-exilic literature. Hosea (2:11, 12:9) and Jeremiah (Lam. 1:4, 2:6-7) are five pre-exilic instances.

Thus the argument from silence is equally conclusive against

the existence of the law after the exile. Further, history offers numerous examples of silence where we would expect mention. There are thirty-three books in the Old Testament and eighteen in the new which do not mention circumcision. The Moham-medans practice it, yet the Koran is silent concerning the rite.

Silence in Other Writings. The writers of the New Testament might be expected to dwell on the one ordinance for the Christian, the Lord's supper, but they are nearly silent. Jesus was the second Adam, but

he never names the first. He alludes to man's creation but not to Adam's fall. How remarkable the silence concerning Eve: not again mentioned in the Old Testament, and only twice in the New.

Secular history presents the same phenomena. The battle of Poitiers, 732 A. D., checked the Mohammedan advance and saved Europe from the civilization of the Koran, yet the monastic annals of that day are silent concerning that which made their continued existence possible. When the allies entered Paris after Waterloo, the leading paper of the city made no mention of the fact. Who commanded at Bunker Hill? We do not know, because of the silence of the participants. The morning after a hotly contested election in Ohio, curiosity was keen to see what the Enquirer, the organ of the defeated party, would say. It was mute. The editorial page was occupied by an insurance advertisement. "In Bradford's History of Plymouth, Morton's Memorial, Elliot's History of New England and Ellis's Puritan Age of Massachusetts, there is no allusion (unless we have overlooked it) to the universal Puritan custom of family prayers and grace at table. In Felt's Ecclesiastical History of New England, in two octavo volumes, where we might reasonably look for some allusion, perhaps, we find no reference to the latter practice. To the former we find only one, in a letter from England concerning servants."†

Gospels Extinct. A strong argument could be made to show that the law of the gospel did not exist from the day of Charlemagne to Luther, if silence of the history is a foundation. In Erasmus's time the monks said to one another, "There is a new book called the New Testament,

†Bartlett: Veracity of the Hexateuch. p. 316.

written in Greek, and it is certain that any one who even reads it will go to the devil". The argument is inane. A thousand years stand between Moses and the exile. To repeat every principal item of the law once in a century, to show that it still existed, would have made the Bible as big and clumsy as a balloon. There are upwards of two thousand references or allusions to the books of the Pentateuch after Deuteronomy, and before Judah goes into exile. They pay no respect to the frantic protest that P was not yet written, but refer to those writings with confidence.

Then there are water marks. When a tooth was found in Missouri measuring eight inches in length and three in breadth, the zoologist immediately affirmed that Missouri had once had a tropical or semi-tropical climate. That tooth demanded a jaw, the jaw a skeleton, the skeleton a previously living animal which could find food only in a warm climate.

Deuteronomy (24:8) referring to leprosy, is a literary fossil. Like the boulders which the glacier of ten thousand years ago dropped in Ohio, so this verse is a boulder. To put one out of sight, a man dug an immense pit close to the boulder. He failed to shore it up properly, and it fell in upon him. He has not been heard from. The theory is crushed, so far as Deuteronomy is concerned, by this boulder. The reference is so natural, the original directions are so full, that the submissive seeker for truth is just as positive that that verse in Deuteronomy knew of the chapters in Leviticus as the geologist is certain that the boulder was cut out by the glacier from the huge sandstone cliffs in northern Canada.

Not to travel all over the territory, but simply to show that this one was not an accident, we cite Judges 20:27-28. This is a time when the advocates of the theory claim that the silence of the history shows that the law was not yet given. "The children of Israel asked of the Lord." This involves the custom of asking of the Lord and receiving an answer. This was by the Urim and Thummim, which was a portion of the ritual belonging to the high priest's office. "The ark of the covenant was there." This reveals the tabernacle, the priesthood, with the high priest who alone could enter into the presence of that holy ark. "And Phineas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, stood before it those days." Here is the very man whom we would

expect to be there, the grandson of Aaron. This is another monster boulder; it logically carries with it the entire ritual law.

20
2062
30
Silence does not exist. The least crack across a mirror destroys the reflection, so the least sound mars silence; but there are numerous voices, viz: the twenty-four times the law is expressly named, the 2062 references or allusions to the law, and the thirty items of furniture in Solomon's Temple. To say that the history in Judges, Samuel or Kings is silent, is to speak recklessly. The full text of the law does not reappear. That could not be expected, but enough of its main institutions do appear to logically embrace the entire ritual. The supposition of Drs. Briggs and Driver, that the law was amended from time to time and in its present form is of the date of the exile, is of the flimsiest gossamer historically. There is not a sentence, not a phrase, in the first seventeen books of the Bible which countenances such an idea.

David was not speaking of that which did not exist, when he charged Solomon to walk in the ways of the Lord, to "keep his statutes and his commandments, his judgments and his testimonies, according to that which is written in the law of Moses". (1 Kings 2:3).

Reasoning From Violation.

The only remaining argument is that from the infraction of the law. The quotations are more numerous than the facts justify. For no one would claim that the disobedience of a law by a transgressor is proof that a law is non-existent. When king Saul is cited as violating the precepts of the law, that is not evidence that he was ignorant of the existence of the Mosaic enactments. Yet the scholars innocently quote that as proof. There would be some force in saying that good men would not deliberately violate a known law. While no one can deny that, yet there are exceptions.

Good Men Break Laws.

In the days of slavery, men sat up at night to run the underground railroad. Better men never trod the earth. The south is chivalrous, deeply religious, never producing an infidel, yet the laws, or the Constitution of the United States is violated daily. Prohibitory laws are constantly evaded and the violation is often connived at by good church members who expect to go to heaven, and possibly to congress.

Charlemagne, he of the iron crown, gave laws to his empire which were observed for a time, then violated, till their very existence was forgotten. Bishop Blomfield says† that there are regulations of the Prayer Book of the Church of England which have never been regularly observed. Some have been almost universally neglected, and one has lost its meaning, so that contrary interpretations are given of it.

Ex-President Bartlet says: "In the straightened times caused by the American Revolution the school laws, both of New Hampshire and Massachusetts, were deliberately disregarded by many whole townships, and the violation by officials was sanctioned by the town vote at the annual meeting." (p. 317):

All religions present an ideal above the reach of their devotees. It would have been a miracle if the Jew had kept that law. He never did. Nor did the Christian community. Under Hildebrand and his successors, the pure religion of Jesus was well nigh exterminated. The Bible was buried beneath papal rescriptions and forged apostolic decretals. The ordinances were changed. Nepotism, simony, and the grossest immorality prevailed. Taking into account the superior age of the world, the higher revelation and larger opportunities, we can safely say that the defection was greater and less excusable during the Dark Ages than that of the Jews during the time of the Judges.

When we read the Sermon on the Mount, the **Law Infracted Now**, thirteenth chapter of 1 Cor., Jas. 2:1-3, and similar exhortations, we are unable to say that they are strictly observed by Christian people even now. Does that suggest that the law of the gospel does not exist?

Testimony was submitted to the Industrial Committee appointed by congress, T. W. Philips chairman, which showed that in 186 months five trunk lines paid to the Standard Oil Co. eleven million dollars. From the rate of \$1.20 the railroads paid the Standard Co. 35 cents rebate on its own shipments and an equal amount on every barrel shipped by rival companies. This violated the Interstate Commerce Act, defrauded the stockholders of the railways, ruined rival companies and gave a monopoly to the company which was able to hold up the roads.

Yet the brainy men who conceived and carried on this gigantic

†The Old Testament . . . 179

monopoly claim to be governed by the law of right, some of them by the precepts of the gospel.

Again and again have these things been quoted, showing plainly that the argument from the violation of law is worthless to prove its non-existence, and just as often the new school pays no attention to the disproof.

The infraction proves the existence of the law. This is the only basis for denunciation by a prophet. Without law there is no transgression. The lawgiver preceded the prophet.

The learned critic's method of securing evidence is peculiar. God commanded Samuel to go to Bethlehem to sacrifice. Surely the lawgiver has a right to suspend or to abrogate his law.

If Samuel had not gone and sacrificed, Dr. Briggs would have accused him of disobeying God's command. But he did go and sacrifice, so the schrewd doctor puts him down anyhow, because Jerusalem is the regular place for sacrifice. He takes them either coming or going. Thus he puts down Joshua for carrying out the command of Moses to build an altar at Ebal. (Deut. 27:5, 6, Josh. 8:30, 31), and Gideon (whom he wrongly puts at Ebal), who was expressly commanded by God (Judges 6:28) to build an altar and offer a sacrifice, and Manoah, who offered under the direction of the angel who was sent to predict the birth of Samson. In any of these cases if the men had done otherwise they would have broken God's commands. Now they are arraigned because they obeyed the heavenly voice.

The professor declares that sacrifices were offered by laymen. The conclusion is hasty. When we read that David dealt among all the people, even among the whole multitude of Israel, both men and women, to every one a cake of bread and a portion of flesh and a cake of raisins, it is not to be concluded that he did all this with his own hands.

"And Solomon offered for the sacrifice of peace offerings which he offered unto the Lord two and twenty thousand oxen and a hundred and twenty thousand sheep." (1 Kings 8:63). But Solomon could not in one day offer these with his own hands. He offered through the priests.

In the law it is prescribed that a man shall lay his hand on his offering and kill it. Then the priest shall sprinkle the

blood (Lev. 4:29). The man is said to offer unto the Lord. So the congregation of the elders of a city are said to offer to the Lord. In 1 Sam. 14:35, 26 we find Saul building an altar to the Lord. We would not suspect the presence of a priest, but the next verse represents the priest as saying: "Let us draw near hither unto God." So in every case a priest may have been present without mention of the fact.

It is repeatedly said that Israel departed from the law of God. No nation reaches in practice the ideal set forth in its constitution and statutes.

Israel was often forsaken of God, and turned over to oppressors because of her defection. Even the priests became corrupt. Eli's sons were sons of Belial. "They knew not the Lord." They sent a servant to take raw meat from the offerer, contrary to the ritual law. If the man insisted that the fat should be burned first, the servant would take it by force. They made the Lord's people to transgress. They lay with the women, that did service, at the door of the tabernacle. Their sins were great before the Lord, for by reason of such wickedness men abhorred the offering of the Lord. In their desperation these men who knew not the Lord, took the ark into battle. But Israel was defeated, Eli's sons were slain. The ark was captured and held by the Philistines for seven months. The 78th Psalm recounts God's dealings with Israel. They provoked him to anger with their high places, and he greatly abhorred Israel, so that he forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh.

Jeremiah presents the indictment of God against

When Not to Pray. Israel when they made the temple a den of robbers. The Lord saw it and said: "Go ye now to my place which was in Shiloh, where I caused my name to dwell at the first, and see what I did to it for the wickedness of my people Israel."

Then he declares that because of their disobedience he will do unto the temple and unto Jerusalem as he did unto Shiloh. "I will cast you out of my sight." God bids Jeremiah not to pray for that people, nor to cry, nor to intercede, for he would not hear.

Samuel was situated as was Jeremiah. God had forsaken Israel. The ark never returned to the tabernacle at Shiloh.

So, as Dr. Briggs points out, Samuel sacrificed at various

places. He was a prophet. God directed him. The ark, the tent of meeting, the shewbread, the Urim and Thummim are all there, but lawlessness prevails.

The new school understand Ex. 20:24, "In every place where I record my name, I will come unto thee and bless thee", to mean that God would record His name in different places at the same time. Hence, Deut. 12:5, "Unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put His name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek and thither shalt thou come, and thither shall you bring your sacrifices", is to them a new and different law.

The same critics claim that the law which Hilkiah found in the temple was Deuteronomy only. The law which they say allowed altars in every place is assigned to E, who wrote one hundred to two hundred years before Josiah was king. If the law in Deuteronomy is different, then it conflicts with the legislation which Josiah had accepted as Mosaic. How did Deuteronomy, being a fiction, obtain currency against a law well established? It turned many altars into sinful offerings; it revolutionized the worship in Israel; yet no one seems to have recognized the antagonism between the regulations of E and D, which are so manifest to the eyes of some modern critics. It is evident that the Jews took both as the legislation of Moses and saw no collision. Perhaps they were right.

There is no discrepancy. God did record his name in various places while Israel was still unsettled. He chose Ebal and Shiloh, and commanded Gideon, Manoah and Samuel to sacrifice in other places. The history of these degenerate days does not say nor suggest that the law of Moses did not exist. The record bears faithful testimony to the departure of the priests and people from the law.

In reviewing the argument from history, we find one wing violently assailing the accuracy of the record, trying to heap upon it opprobrious adjectives, as though that were argument. The evangelical wing is hazy. Sometimes it travels a route parallel to that of the extreme school, but without their coarseness. In that case they take for granted that which could not be proved, viz: the utter unreliability of the sacred history, either by pronouncing it legendary or by despotically choking the witness. Promising to make the discrepancy between the traditional

theory and the historical books clear to every reader, Prof. Smith then says in effect: "But we must not allow the Pentateuch, nor the book of Joshua, nor the Chronicles to testify. Their testimony is not compatible with the purpose in hand."

The recourse to mere rhetorical emendations is **The Theory Lacks Historical Foundation.** a chimera. There is nothing to sustain it aside from the subjective feeling of a few scholars.

Finally the attempt to make an argument out of the silence and the transgression of the law exhibits the barrenness of the land, for the silence is four hundred years too late. The disobedience is what is constantly asserted. Those arguments are of no positive probative force. The most that could be said if they could have been upheld would be negative. They would affirm nothing. But they gently slip down to where the question is easiest confused, to the dark and stormy days of Israel. Why the Pentateuch and every other book in the Bible invariably assigns the law to Moses is not explained at all. Many questions of that nature have been propounded to the advocates of the new theory but they are chary of answers. Another weakness is to class the Pentateuch with Job as anonymous when it is vocal as to its author.

There is no support for the theory, historically. No writer ever denied the Mosaic authorship. No writer intimates that any one else ever lifted a pen in writing the law. No writer testifies that he ever saw or heard of any one who had ever had the most distinct idea that E or J or D or P were Jews. They are Gentiles according to the Bible history, if they ever breathed. It is not an inevitable conclusion that because a theory is opposed to biblical statements, therefore the theory is false. At least we must admit that Calvin's quotations against Copernicus were misplaced. But the men who believed Copernicus had the courage to express their convictions, without such confusion of thought as is unhappily found with the new school at this time.

However, the new school prides itself on being scientific. Numerous quotations will be given to present their allegiance to the demands of scientific investigation. Some statements, not as plentiful, will be forthcoming from the conservative, pledging him to abide the scientific test. Before that, it is necessary to peep into the museum which the spade of the archaeologist has unearthed. It confirms the biblical history. By other reasoning

than the argument from history must the new theory establish its right to a place on earth in the twentieth century. "There are many critics who have at great length stated their preference for the false before the true; . . . and it may be safely said that there is no class of literary productions in our country, in which there is such an enormous preponderance of error and bad judgment as in that of historical criticism".†

†Prof. Ransey: St. Paul, the Traveler and the Roman Citizen, p. 3.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ARGUMENT FROM ARCHÆOLOGY.

Archæology the Handmaid of History I. Archæology is a branch of history. It is the changeless voice of monuments, written in languages which long ago ceased to be spoken or written by man. The Bible contains the oldest history. Upon it alone must we depend for knowledge of the earliest dawn. For thousands of years it is our only guide. But the Bible is written with a religious purpose. To that purpose the history of individuals, or of a family, or of a single nation, is of far more importance than that of all the remainder of the race. Unbelief has ever been eager to discredit the history in order to discount the revelation. Archæology supplements history.

"In less than thirty years a new world of unknown languages and peoples has been opened for study; thirty centuries of history have come forth from the tombs and reappeared in the full light of day."—*Prof. Maspero.*

"A New Old Testament." This is the robust phrase of an enthusiastic professor of Semitic Languages and Literature in the University of Chicago.†

When he has jotted down some of the "credits for the Old Testament", "historical", "archæological", "geographical", "chronological", "ethnographical", "religious", "linguistic", and "exegetical" credits, he says: "Our old Old Testament has now become a marvelously new Old Testament" (Monuments, p. 300).

†The Monuments and the O. T. Prof. Ira M. Price Chicago. Christian Culture Press, 1899.

One notable feature of the exhumed testimony **Believert in New Theory Bear Witness** is that in large measure it is furnished by men who are free lances in biblical criticism. Prof. Sayce (Higher Criticism and the Monuments), whom Canon Driver calls "Our foremost English representative of archaeology" is a professor in Oxford. He believes that the new school is right in regard to Daniel. But his testimony in regard to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch stands unimpeached.

Prof. Hommel (The Ancient Hebrew Tradition) accepts the critical theory of documents underlying the Pentateuch. To him we are indebted for most of the names which form our archaeological strata.

Dr. Schrader, professor of Oriental Languages in Berlin University, is in harmony with the analytical theory but not with the extreme wing.

These men would seem to stand as proof that scholars may accept the new theory on account of its scientific presentation, and linguistic arguments, when candid scholarship obliges them to array archaeological results in opposition to the denial of the truth of the biblical history.

More scholars are engaged in archaeological investigation than in the Pentateuchal controversy. It is far more difficult. The analysis of the Pentateuch is mere child's play in comparison with the subtle intricacy and slow revelation of the mystic characters. This demands broader generalization and enlists abler minds. They are, as Prof. Howard Osgood remarks, larger in another sense. They do not dwell on a single theme, and draw conclusions from their own speculations, but have extended data. They have hundreds of books in stone and clay; sculptured slabs, clay tablets, seals, inscriptions on walls and papyri, large portions of which have never been deciphered, lying in museums in Europe and America.

Discoveries. II. In 1799 a French engineer in Napoleon's army in Egypt, found the Rosetta stone. Nelson seized Alexandria and the Rosetta stone is in the British Museum. It bears an inscription written in Greek, in the sacred hieroglyphics of Egypt, and in the common language. It waited eighteen years for a reader. Champollion un-

locked the puzzle, and fitted a key to the history of a people who antedated the common chronology of the Old Testament by 3000 years. In thirty years, by the patient labors of many Egyptologists, the history of the peoples of the Nile Valley for nearly 5000 years B. C. was revealed.

The Old Testament begins in Mesopotamia. Names of persons and places and narratives of events are numerous. Travelers had noticed on bits of burnt brick wedge-shaped characters.

M. Botta, a French consul at Mosul, on the Tigris, unearthed a palace whose walls were covered with figures of battles, sieges and hunting scenes. The same wedge-shaped, cuneiform characters abounded. The archæological world was aroused to enthusiasm. It was found to be the palace of Sargon (722-705 B. C.), probably the largest palace of the world's history, covering twenty-five acres with magnificent buildings. Many of its treasures are in the Louvre, Paris.

A. H. Layard, in 1845, exhumed the palace of a king of Assyria, Assurnatsirpal (884-860 B. C.), a contemporary of Omri, king of Israel. Layard found three palaces. Many of the colossi, winged bulls and eagle-headed gods are to be seen in the British museum.

Layard discovered Nineveh, lost for 2000 years; its very site forgotten. He uncovered Sennacherib's palace, king of Assyria, (705-681 B. C.) whose army of 185000 was destroyed in a night (701 B. C.) Isa. 37.

In 1835 H. C. Rawlinson discovered an inscription cut on the perpendicular face of one of the Zagros Mountains, northeast of Persia. It was about 350 feet above the base. The ledge was worn to only fourteen inches in width. Sometimes mounted on a ladder supported by that narrow ledge, sometimes suspended by ropes over the precipice of 350 feet, the undaunted Englishman copied the cuneiform inscriptions. In four years he finished the task. In ten years he completed the translation of the four hundred lines. They were cut by the order of Darius, king of Persia, about 515 B. C.

By the aid of this the Babylonian inscriptions
Translations. were deciphered. To test the ability of the archæologists, in 1857, "four men, H. C. Rawlinson, the discoverer and translator of the old Persian inscrip-

tion; Edw. Hincks, an Irishman; J. Oppert, a Frenchman, still living; H. F. Talbot, an Englishman, met in London. The trustees of the British Museum gave each a fine lithographic copy of a long historical inscription, and asked that he work independently, and present at a specified time the results of his work. At the given date all appeared and compared results. To the great surprise and profound satisfaction of every one, their translations agreed substantially from beginning to end. The triumph was almost incredible; the victory was complete."[†]

The Language. The difficulty overcome will not be fully realized by the reader until he knows that there are 550 distinct signs. From two to thirty wedges form a sign. They may be parallel or crossed or inserted on each other. There is no alphabet. Some characters, like the Chinese, are signs of ideas; others are like the Japanese syllabary, and may also have an ideographic value. Some of them have more than one syllabic signification, rising to as high as thirteen. As in Japanese, the same sign may have both syllabic and ideographic value, which, is to be determined by the context. One published translation contains nearly 15,000 combinations expressing simple and compound ideas.

The cuneiform language is as nearly related to Hebrew as Italian is to Spanish.

In 1888 the Moabite stone was discovered. It is now in Paris. It is dedicated to Chemosh, the God of Moab, mentioned in the Scriptures. It records a victory over Ahab, king of Israel (about 875 B. C). It bears thirty-four lines of inscription. The characters are the same as those found in a conduit to the pool of Siloam, cut during Hezekiah's reign. The Samaritan Pentateuch is also written in these characters.

Thirty Thousand Tablets. In 1872, Geo. Smith, a bright light too early extinguished, found a clay tablet with an account of the deluge. He excavated in Nineveh and found thirty thousand tablets and cylinders, the library of Assurbanipal, (668-626 B. C.), a contemporary of Manasseh and Josiah, kings of Judah.

He found the famous Creation tablets, but died of a fever in Syria, in 1876.

[†]Price. Monuments, p. 39.

Rassoum, in behalf of the British Museum, employed five hundred diggers on several sites. He brought back many valuable inscriptions to the museum. One half of these are yet unread.

All Palestine has been examined almost inch by inch. Sites have been identified when only a heap or some rude homes remained of once populous cities. Dug out of mounds, tombs and ruined cities, written on stone, clay tablets, temples or mountain side, on subjects trivial or momentous, the literature unearthed and deciphered is large and of decisive weight.

In 1887 a peasant woman picked up a clay tablet, the first of three hundred, in size a little less than 6x4 inches, in Tel-el Amarna. That is the modern name of a long line of mounds which extend along the eastern branch of the Nile, midway between the towns of Minish and Assioat. It is the site of a once very important city. The eighteenth dynasty began by driving the Hyksos out of Egypt, and ended by becoming itself Asiatic. By intermarriage the ruler of Egypt became half Asiatic in blood and wholly Asiatic in taste. A fierce convulsion followed. The king retreated from Thebes and built Tel-el Amarna. To this place he removed his library, which is now exhumed. It is written in the cuneiform characters of Babylon. This shows that the Babylonian was the court language. But the tablets are like our mail of today. Some of them are on trifling topics. Every educated man could write.

The difficulty of obtaining an education in that day was great. It reveals brains as vigorous as those of our own time. Schools, teachers, libraries were known.

The clay letters came from Phœnicia, Syria, Babylon and Palestine.

The museum of Berlin has three of the tablets in which the name of Urusalem appears, Jerusalem, Lachish, Gaza, Megiddo, and Bashad were postoffices. Kirjath Sepher means "book town". These tablets were written between 1500 and 1450 B. C. This brings the children of Isreal in close contact with a state of high literary activity.

There is a strong probability that a mighty prince like Abraham could write. Long before his day there were public libraries and numerous readers. There were books on clay and papyrus, new ones being constantly added. Writing was common then, as in many civilized countries today. This being true in Abraham's day, much greater is the probability that the children of Israel would write their history. But men do not usually write for history what their contemporaries know to be false. If they did it would soon fall into contempt.

Major Condor says of these tablets: †"It is clear that these letters are the most important historical records ever found in connection with the Bible, and that they most fully confirm the historical statements of the book of Joshua, and prove the antiquity of civilization in Syria and in Palestine."

Tell-el Hesi was exhumed by Americans. Prof. American Explorations. Petrie began it, and it was completed by F. J. Bliss. It is a site where city was built on top of city. Jer. 50:18 alludes to the custom and fortells the rebuilding of Jerusalem on its own heap. "Tell" is the Hebrew for "heap". This site covered about two acres. The outer slope had been washed away, leaving the strata exposed. By careful digging and by marking the pottery in each successive layer, the explorer at last got down to the original Amorite city of Lachish, which Joshua destroyed. As we go down, remains of mud buildings appear for ten feet. The Arab graves are above these. Beneath them is found Greek pottery. Then the period of the Jews after their return from Babylon is reached. Below this is a stratum of twenty feet which represents the city as it stood in Solomon's time. Still lower is a layer of charcoal and lime dust, an imperishable monument of the destruction of Lachish. Yet under this are relics of bronze, which form the oldest stratum. Here a cuneiform tablet was discovered, which, read in connection with some of the Tell-el Amarna tablets, verified the conjecture that it is the site of ancient Lachish.

†Tent Life in Palestine, p. 6.

Mr. Bliss further reports that he found Amosite (which is pre-Israelitish) pottery in the debris of the walls of Jericho. He also found traces of a mud wall. "I confess this wall sent a thrill through me. . . . There is good reason to suppose that this wall, uncovered near the base of the mound, at its edge, is the very wall which fell before the eyes of Captain Joshua." (Quarterly Statement, Palestine Exploration Fund, July, 1894). The mounds of Palestine are the pages of an ancient book. All this corroborates the tradition that the book of Joshua is ancient and trustworthy.

Since 1887 the University of Pennsylvania has made marvelous discoveries at Nippur, in lower Babylonia. To enter the museum of that university, or the Metropolitan of New York, is to stand among the ruins of a civilization whose birth long antedates that of Abraham.

III. It may be contended that when God shaped seas and land, he fashioned Palestine to be a witness to the truth of his word. For four thousand years its history has affirmed the supernatural.

Palestine became the blackboard, Israel the crayon, history the hand by which God wrote lessons for all nations. Possibly worlds other than our own were interested in that most tragic death of time.

In order that Israel might be compacted together as a solid mass, Egypt became the furnace which fused them into one. The going forth of this band of slaves, their subsisting in the desert, their subsequent conquest of Canaan, their peculiar religion, the stubborn monotheism which made them intractable where all others bowed to Cæsar's image, their sacred books which trace this monotheism back to the beginning, are facts which are unquestionable.

The purpose of God demanded seclusion and publicity. That is, the chosen people was to be separated from others till they were drilled for the work of the conversion of the world. Then they were to go forth to the nations. Palestine admirably fulfilled these conditions. Wrapped by the the desert on the south and east, washed by an angry sea on the west, it was frowned upon by the towering peaks of Lebanon on the north. Israel

might have imitated her maritime neighbors, the Phœnicians, were it not that nature forbade. The Phœnician coast had good harbors; Palestine had none. The black reef at Joppa sometimes made a landing impossible. So Israel was immured. But that strip of land was the highway for every caravan or army from Asia or Europe into Africa. Thus the peculiar people become known. Thus, when the time came to go, the apostles of truth could quickly reach the civilized world.

The natural features of Palestine form a large variety. There are plains, mountains, valleys, hills, caves, cliffs, torrent, lake, sea and desert. The history is molded by the topography. A multitude of places are named in the history. A stranger to the scenes could not write accurately. Often has that been tried. Dickens makes mistakes in geographical allusions, and he is with a large company. Charles Francis Adams, in his biography of his father, puts Galusha A. Grow of Pennsylvania, in Illinois; Lot M. Morrill of Maine, in Vermont; and L. Q. C. Lamar of Mississippi, in Alabama.

Columbus believed the world to be round, but thought it was only ten or twelve thousand miles in circumference. The Jamestown colony believed that following the Chickahominy river they could reach the Pacific ocean.

125- In the Pentateuch there are almost one hundred and twenty-five names of places. To thread one's way carefully through all this geographical maze, making no mistake, a direct acquaintance with the country is necessary. When modern travelers have taken the Bible, and examined every hill and valley and rock and cave, they have found no discrepancy whatever. Renan said: "Palestine is a fifth Gospel."

The uninspired writers of the apocryphal, or of classical history, made grave mistakes in regard to persons and names.

Herodotus (484-424 B. C.) enjoys the distinction of being called the "Father of History."

"He placed the pyramid builders after the time of Rameses or Sesostris, and but shortly before the age of the Ethiopians, Sabako and Tirhakah, although in reality they preceded them by centuries."

Among the Egyptian kings, a Greek demigod and Lake Moeris

are made to figure, and the work of Herodotus abounds in small inaccuracies in the explanations of Egyptian words and customs, and in the descriptions of the products of the country.†

His account of Assyria and Babylonia is still more misleading. The Assyrian and Babylonian empires are confounded. Sennacherib is called King of the Arabians, and Nebuchadnezzar is transformed into Labynetos I (or Nabonidos), and made the father of the real Nabonidos. The fortifications of Babylonia are ascribed to a queen (Nitokris), who bears an Egyptian name, and is placed five generations after Semiramis, a title of the Babylonian goddess Istar of Ashtoreth; while Ninos, that is, Nineveh, is supposed to be an Assyrian monarch and termed the son of Belos or Baal."‡

Prof. Sayce further tells us that Ktesios, a
The Persian Errs. physician to the Persian king, Artaxerxes, who had access to the state archives, wrote a book to show where Herodotus had "lied", as he termed the errors. But he misses the truth with equally sublime indifference to facts.

He puts Belos, Ninos and Semiramis in the line of Assyrian kings. Two of their gods—a sun god and a war god—he pulls down into the list of kings. He errs by two centuries as to the date of the fall of the Assyrian empire, and pictures the last king, Sardanapolis, choosing to burn to death in his palace rather than to fall into the hands of his foes. His Sardanapolis is Assurbanipal on the monuments. He was not the last king, and burned to death his brother, who was defeated in a rebellion. Dr. Ktesios causes Arbakes the Mede and Belesys the Babylonian to overthrow Nineveh. The monuments tell us it was Kyaxerxes and Nabopolassar (who was the father of Nebuchadnezzar).

Thus the Greek and Persian failed. Did the uninspired Jew succeed better? Between the Old and New Testaments are a

†Herodotus was usually careful. It was not what he saw himself, but what he heard that is inaccurate. He says there are no vines in Egypt, yet elsewhere refers to their wines and raisins. He said that the use of wheat and barley bread as food was considered disgraceful, and had the Egyptians drinking out of brazen cups only.

‡The Witness of Ancient Monuments. Prof. Sayce, Living Papers, Vol. VI,

number of apocryphal books. Tobit and Judith claim to be historical. Tobit says he was taken prisoner alone with his brethren of the tribe of Naphtali, by the Assyrian king, Enemesser, whose son and successor was Sennacherib. But it was Tiglath-Pileser who carried Naphtali into captivity. He was not related to Sennacherib. There were two reigns and twenty-two years between them. By Enemesser is probably meant the Assyrian, Sallimanu-esir, who did not belong to the same family as Sennacherib the son of Sargon.

Sargon, who is unknown to Tobit, seized the throne on the death of Shalmaneser. Tobit makes the murder of Sennacherib to be only forty-five days after his return from the campaign against Hezekiah. In reality, he lived twenty years between the two verses 37 and 38 of Isaiah 37th chapter.

Tobit is equally unfortunate in geography. Rajes of Media is a city which probably had no existence in the days of Sennacherib. It was unknown to the Assyrians, hence could not have been a settlement of the captive Israelites. So with Ecbatana. It is not mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions before the fall of Nineveh. Yet Tobit is said to have visited both these cities.

That district was overrun by Sargon, and the monuments of his time are silent in regard to these cities. Tobit affirms that Nineveh was overthrown by Nebuchadnezzar and Ahasuerus. Ahasuerus is the Hebrew form of Xerxes. He was a Persian prince who did not reign until a century and a half after Nineveh fell.

Judith is another historical book. It says that Nebuchadnezzar ruled in Nineveh, which had been destroyed and abandoned before Nebuchadnezzar held the scepter. Then he ruled not over Assyria, but over Babylon. Judith makes Arphaxad king over the Medes, in Ecbatana. Kyaxares ruled over Ecbatana. Arphaxad is a name found in Gen. 10, but it is Chaldean. A king over the Medes would not be likely to have a name derived from the widely different Chaldean tongue. The author is wild in historical details which involve geography: He makes Nebuchadnezzar to conquer Ecbatana, then return to Nineveh. He says his army overran Syria and Palestine and threatened Jerusalem in the 18th year of his reign, which was two years after the

destruction of Jerusalem. The remaining Jews had fled to Egypt.

The name of the general who is said to have commanded the expedition, whom Judith murdered, Holofernes, is Persian and not Babylonian. Cilicia in Asia Minor he makes to be but three days journey from Nineveh. Mesopotamia he puts on the western side of the Euphrates.

Lud or Lydia, which was in the extreme west of Asia Minor, and Phut, which was in the east of Africa, and Rosh, which was no country at all; but a word in Ezekiel 38: 2, meaning "chief", he groups as three nations in the vicinity of Assyria. He throws the children of Ishmael there also, while they have always lived in northern Arabia. Joakim, the high priest, he has a hundred years before he was born.

These errors prove how meagre and erroneous was the knowledge of geography, how soon historical events fell into confusion, in those ancient days. Kings had their libraries, but they were closed to foreigners. The complicated system of writing shut out all strangers. The massive library of Nineveh was buried beneath the ruins of the city, not to see a resurrection till the nineteenth century.

The full strength of this argument can not be **A Strong Argument.** estimated. Away back of Abraham's day the monuments speak. From that time on, every allusion to every name, 4000 in all, in the Bible has been examined microscopically. Every hill, valley, stone and cave in the lands of the Bible has been scrutinized. The spade has eagerly turned the ancient soil in Egypt and Assyria, as well as in Palestine and Syria, with the invariable result that every addition to knowledge has been an additional proof of the truthfulness of the Bible account.

With the seven writers of Dr. Driver or the nine of Dr. Briggs and several redactors; with the eighteen of Kuenen and twenty-two of Wellhausen, there is great peril of mistake. Marches, battles, surveys, mountains and valleys are described, often minutely. In the clay tablets 350 towns in Palestine and the borders of Syria are named.

Each of the supposed writers might have missed in any one of the thousands of names of persons and places. Each might have made 125 mistakes in regard to places already identified in Palestine. A dozen writers might have made twelve times 125,

or 1500 mistakes. On Wellhausen's estimate there is room for twice as many. We have already convicted Greek, Persian, Jew, Englishman and American of such errors.

How fared the Jew who wrote the Bible?
Thousands of Errors Through that long and intricate maze of persons, places and incident, the biblical writers
Possible, pass without hesitation and without error.
Yet No Mistake.

Uninspired writers fail ignominiously. The impossibility of such accuracy by writers who lived six hundred to a thousand years after Moses is evident.

The longer the consideration of this fact, the deeper will be the conviction that the Bible was not written by a long line of irresponsible and self-chosen authors. It is not credible that God would inspire J1, J2, E1, E2, P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, D1, D2, JE, H. R1, R2, R3, R4, to write what one man could have written.

The hypothesis does not claim that these men
A Miracle. were inspired. Dr. Briggs expressly disowns it for the original writers. Then, if not inspired, the record rises to the height of a miracle. With the very best intentions, Englishmen and Americans, Jews and Greeks have erred in writing of names and places. The biblical authors write fearlessly of foreign kings and of other lands, and their work challenges the closest scrutiny. If merely human, their knowledge is miraculous; if divinely guided, then they wrote the truth and not colored legends.

How do the critics meet this? They do not.
Square Denial of Wellhausen bluntly denies the truth of both
Testimony. the history and the monuments. He says the names were forged so as to give the appearance of antiquity to the documents. Prof. Driver ignores the real issue. He admits that Moses could write, and says that archæology has not disproved any point made by the critics. Evidently he means linguistic points, for archæology removes the historical basis assumed by his theory. With style or vocabulary it has nothing to do, but simply proves that the writers of the sacred books lived among the scenes they depicted.

A brief examination will make this yet more evident.

IV. Beginning with Genesis 1st. we read a **Creation Tablets.** matchless epic of creation. Its first four words, its first sentence, are the sublimest clause and sentence in literature. The successive steps are on the firm granite foundation of a positive knowledge of creation. Geologists have pointed out the scientific accuracy of what is related, till Gladstone could safely challenge Prof. Huxley to write in as few words a better account of creation. The rocks have revealed God. They have pushed back the age of the earth from a few thousand to many millions of years. Again the rocks disturb the accepted chronology, not to give man nine millions of years, as Dr. Hunt guessed, nor many hundreds of thousands of years, as Draper thought, nor the 100,000 to 240,000 of Lubbock and Lyell, but the 8000 of Wright's "Ice Age in North America".

The creation tablets of Babylon present six points of similarity to the Mosaic record. Chaos, light, land, stars, sun and moon set in their places, animals and man. There are unlikenesses:

Chaldean Account of Creation. The Babylonian record has several gods engaged in the work of creation. It makes the waste and abyss to be warriors; the sun, moon and stars to be mansions to the gods.

The similarities indicate a common source. This dates the Genesis account prior to Abraham. The new theory makes Moses ignorant of all this early history, and the children of Israel with out written account of creation till about 800 B. C. Then J began in the middle of verse 2:4 and wrote a jumbled account of creation in this order: earth, heaven, mist, man, Eden, beasts, fowls, woman. Then about 450 B. C. P wrote Genesis and completed the dependent clause with which J began:

Seven. The week is a division of time not suggested by nature, as were the day, month and year. The Sabbath was known and observed among the Babylonians. Its name, its restrictions, link it with the Hebrew law. Seven was also a sacred number with that people. A hymn says: "Seven is the number of spirits whose origin is in the depths, who know neither order nor custom, nor listen to prayers and desires. Seven and twice seven is the knot to be tied by the

woman who sits by the bedside of her sick husband and conjures the evil spirits."†

Eden. The inscriptions of Babylonia frequently mention the Tigris and the Euphrates rivers.

In a list of irrigating canals, two bear the names Guhana and Pisanu, possibly the Gihon and Pishon of Genesis 2d. The primitive sacred garden, with a tree whose fruit would perpetuate life, is also frequent. Approach to that tree seems to have been limited to gods and distinguished persons. The fall is not recorded in words. One very ancient cylinder has a tree with fruit, and under it a man and woman on opposite sides of the tree. Behind the woman, with its head near hers, is the crooked form of a serpent. The group is left to tell its own story.

The fullest account given in the tablets is that of the deluge. It is disfigured with polytheism. It makes the rain so terrific that the gods feared, and crouched like dogs, in the farthest corner of heaven.

The interesting feature of all is that while the sage scholars have this written by J, 800 B. C., and P, 450 B. C.; and the two accounts put together by R, and the acumen of the modern critic sufficient to dissect the record, here is an account in 185 lines with J and P together, and older than Abraham.

Noah's Birds. These profound modern scholars have devoted page after page to the discovery of the best speculation as to which author wrote about the raven, and which about the dove. The critic Hupfeld, who gave the raven to J and the dove to P, was equalled in the seriousness and absolute certainty of his convictions by Delitzsch, who reversed the names.

These oppose Knobel, who gave both birds to P. He, in turn, had to give way to Dillman, who assigned both to J.

After all this worry over dividing the birds between two men who lived 400 years apart, the voluminous clay tablets were unearthed. These contain both birds and a swallow, the entire account written by one hand, 2000 B. C., if not earlier.

†Price; Monuments, p. 87.

There is no part of the Old Testament upon which the monuments have thrown more light than upon the tenth chapter of Genesis. It shows us that the names were arranged ethnographically and present the chief settlements of the descendants of the sons of Noah. Out of this mysterious list of proper names the inscriptions verify the accuracy of more than thirty, by indicating both places and peoples. The inscriptions both of Egypt and of Mesopotamia corroborate in many particulars the statements of this chapter. In a word, this table is a bird's eye view of early nations, a word map of ancient geography.†

The home whence Abraham emigrated was
Ur Found. long a lost city. Ur of the Chaldees was once a port of the Persian Gulf. The detritus of the river has filled up all but the channel for 150 miles below the ancient city. The inscriptions give a list of kings who reigned before Babylon came into prominence. The god to whom Abraham would not bow the knee, though Ur worshipped at that shrine, was called Sin. It was the moon.

Genesis 14 is the *bête noir* of the new school.
Gen. 14th Correct. Kuenen lands it this side of the exile and pronounces it unhistorical. Schrader, Dillman and Kittell regard it as an old piece taken up by E. Wellhausen says E is the farthest from it; he leaves it an orphan. Kautzsch and Socin print it in type by itself. Noldeke says it is altogether fictitious; that several of the names are the invention of the writer. Knobel and Delitz give it to J, but say he borrowed it from ancient source.

Driver, bewildered by the noise and dust of conflicting opinions and the inherent difficulty of reconciling it with the theory, gives up in despair. He does not know to whom it belongs. It has words which the critics have given to P, to J, to E. To cut out the words in each verse which belong to their supposed writers is difficult. To admit that it is historical and in its place never entered the head of any of the new school.

Prof. Sayce says concerning the denial of its historicity: "Oriental archaeology has vindicated its authenticity in a remark-

†Price; Monument, p 99

able way, and disproved the ingenuous skepticism." His account can be found in either "Fresh Light from the Monuments", pp. 44-47, or "Higher Criticism and the Monuments", pp. 161-169.

Here we have space for only a few lines. The idea held by the radical critics, that until 800-600 B. C. the nations were separated from each other by ignorance of geography and the absence of roads, is shown to be erroneous. As early as 3800 B. C. Sargon I had made a military expedition as far as the Island of Cyprus. He and his son, Naram-Sin made four incursions into Western Asia. The declaration in Genesis 14, of the conquest of the five kings who served Chedarlaomer twelve years, then rebelled and were again overcome, is not a rare occurrence in Babylonian annals. The names are veracious. The first part of the name of the leading king "Chedar", is "Kudar". It is equivalent to Czar, Pharaoh or Abimelech, each being a general title for a ruler. "Kudar" is the Elamite word. The second portion, Lagamar, was an Elamite God. The full name signifies, "God is my king". Other words in the chapter have come forth from the monuments, rendering it indelibly and historically in harmony with the customs of the day.

The thorough acquaintance of the writer of the **Egyptian Customs.** Pentateuch with Egypt would demand a small book for its elucidation. The friendship shown to Abraham is explained by the revelation that at that time an Asiatic dynasty was in power. The same condition explains Joseph's high promotion. The first Hyksos ruler was called Salatis, in Aramaic, Shallit, and Joseph was called (Gen. 42:6) hash-shallit (governor). Later the Assyrians named the Pharaoh "shiltanu," that is, sultan.†

The minute accuracy of the allusions to the customs of the Egyptians is brought out by the inscriptions. Shaving is abhorred by the Semitic people even to this day, but Joseph shaved before he appeared before Pharaoh. The importance attached to dreams; the terror caused by thunder; the carrying of baskets on the head; watering, that is, pumping, by foot; divination with a cup; beheading; sitting at meals (for the Jews recline); the installation into office with a seal ring and a collar of gold; the exalted position of the high priest of On, are some of the minute, yet unerring, evidences of acquaintance with the Egypt of that day. The Jews in the desert did not know Canaan.

Large portions of the ritual law have been traced to the Egypt of that period. The Egypt of the time of Isaiah and Jeremiah was under very different conditions.

R. S. Poole, an archæologist connected with the British Museum, says (*Contemporary Review*, vol. 34, p. 758): "The Egyptian documents emphatically call for a reconsideration of the whole question of the date of the Pentateuch. It is now certain that the narrative of the history of Joseph, and the sojourn and exodus of the Israelites—that is to say, the portion from Gen. 39, Ex. 15, so far as it relates to Egypt—is substantially not much later than B. C. 1300. In other words, it was written while the memory of the events was fresh. The minute accuracy of the text is inconsistent with any later date. It is not merely that it shows knowledge of Egypt under the Ramessides and yet earlier. The condition of the country, the chief cities of the frontier, the composition of the army, are true of the age of the Ramessides and not true of the age of the Pharaoh contemporary with Solomon and his successors. If the Hebrew documents are of the close of the period of the kings of Judah, how is it that they are true of its earlier condition, not of that which was contemporary with those kings? Why is the Egypt of the law markedly different from the Egypt of the prophets, each condition being described consistently with the Egyptian records themselves? Why is Egypt described in the Law as one kingdom and no hint given of the break up of the empire into the small principalities mentioned by Isaiah (19:2)."

The unfounded, but necessary, assumption by
Development Back- the radical advocate of the development hy-
ward. pothesis, that Israel proceeded from feticism, animism, polytheism to monotheism, which was reached in the eighth century B. C., is not considered worthy of notice by the archæologist. The question between them, especially as to Egypt, is, which was prior, polytheism or monotheism? The schools divide. Brugsch, Chabas, Grebont, Pierret, Renouf, Lauth, Mariette, Rabion, DeRonge, Tiele hold that monotheism preceded. On the other hand, Ebers, Ermon, Lenormant, Lieblen, Maspero, Meyer, Reinisch, Weederman make polytheism to have been primary.

However, under the 18th and 19th dynasties all **Monotheism Early.** Egyptologists teach that monotheism was established. These dynasties extended from 1703 to 1288 B. C. It was during the 18th dynasty that the Hebrews went out of Egypt. That dynasty lasted 241 years. Some ascribe the monotheism of this long period to the influence of the Hebrews.

The first Sallier papyrus tells of a shepherd king, Apepi, who "took to himself a single god for Lord, refusing to serve any other god in the whole land". This perfectly agrees with the language used by the Pharaoh whom Joseph helped: "Can we find such a one as this, a man in whom the spirit of God is? Forasmuch as God has showed thee all this, there is none so discreet as thou."

Joseph. A tomb has been found in Elkab which bears an inscription written by Baba who lived in Thebes, when Joseph was a power in Memphis, hundreds of miles away. This tomb is of an officer under Joseph and describes both the plenty and the famine. Since the Nile overflows every year, a famine is not one of the ordinary events in Egypt. But here is one recorded in the tomb of a contemporary of Joseph. He gathered grain during the plenteous time and gave it out in famine: "I collected corn as the friend of the harvest god. I was watchful at the time of sowing, and when a famine arose lasting many years, I distributed corn to the city each year of the famine."

Treasure Cities. Pithom and Raamses, the treasure cities, Ex. 1:11, have arisen from the tomb. In the British Museum, bricks made without straw, taken from these cities, are on exhibition. They are about 18 inches long by 8 wide, stamped with Pharaoh's name.

Israel. Prof. Flinders Petrie, under the auspices of the University of Pennsylvania, made investigations on the site of ancient Thebes. He found a slab of black syenite ten feet high, five feet wide, and thirteen inches thick, polished like a mirror. In its inscription is found the name of Israel, which, so far, has been found mentioned but twice in the monuments of Egypt. The under side of this slab

was inscribed by Meneptah II, who is believed to have been the Pharaoh who refused to let Israel go, and suffered the plagues. It is a boastful record of the subjugation of all the enemies of the king, and Israel is of the number. The oppression of Israel or the pursuit into the Red Sea may be the subjugation meant. He says he spoiled the people of Israel and left them without seed; a royal falsehood.

The death of the first born of Meneptah, a son of eighteen years, is believed by some to be proved by his unfinished tomb at Thebes.

Hittites. The Hittites appear in the Old Testament a people as strong as the Egyptians. Fifty years ago the ranks of scholarship held men who were sure that the Hittites never existed. That "opinion of the best scholarship" has no advocate now. The supremacy of the Hittites in Asia Minor and northern Syria is proved by both Egyptian and Assyrian monuments. They went down before the arms of Sargon II, in 717 B. C. Manasseh, king of Judah, was carried captive. This Sargon is named but once in the Old Testament, Isa. 20:1. For a long time scholars were sure that Isaiah was mistaken, that no such monarch existed. He stands forth on the monument as a remarkable warrior. His palace has since been recovered.

From the fact that the theory posits Babylon as the birth-place of nearly half of the Pentateuch, we may reason:

Samaritan Pentateuch. (a). It is exceedingly improbable that Ezra would allow the Samaritans to copy the Pentateuch. It is equally improbable that they would have accepted it if permitted, for it prohibits mixed marriages. Both Ezra and Nehemiah relentlessly enforced this law. The enmity between the two parties was too great to render it probable that the Samaritans would ever have obtained privilege to copy P.

(b). The old square character of the Samaritan Pentateuch is that of the 8th or 9th century B. C. The writing of Ezra is of later date and form.

These two factors: the enmity which would have prevented the Samaritan from copying Ezra's Pentateuch, the Jew not permitting, the Samaritan being too proud; and the square letters

in the Samaritan Pentateuch, overthrow the theory that P wrote nearly half the Pentateuch in Babylon.

It were a laborious task to describe all the correspondences, all the ways in which the Scriptures have been sustained by the testimony of Gentile engravers in clay and stone. In all the minutæ of such a multitude of recitals of persons, places and actions, they never err in their descriptions.

Ordinarily we would reason that these things **Biblical History True.** amount to a demonstration of the fidelity and accuracy of the biblical writers. Never having been convicted of deception or falsehood, with no external fact to impugn their veracity, they ought to be counted not guilty of lying. Then the man who belabors these venerable records as "fictitious", "absurd", "impossible", "corrupt", is not reasoning, but raving.

The author who daubs slime on the sacred history by saying "an ideal representation", "can hardly be possible", "legends colored and modified", "speeches manufactured", is not scholarly. Nor is his classification redeemed from the charge of reckless assertion by a cheap and nebulous statement that these writings are inspired.

It would seem to be impossible for a man to read archæology and yet deny the truthfulness of the history. Every position taken by the traducers of the Old Testament history, has been crushed by the stones, if it came within their range. Every position taken by the biblical writers has been exalted by the monuments.

Next, it would seem to be impossible for a man **To Believe Bible and Theory is Difficult.** to accept the simple, straight-forward history in the Pentateuch and the preexilic books, and believe the theory which denies Mosaic authorship to the law. Yet there are strong men who can. Prof. Hommel (The ancient Hebrew Tradition 1897), and Prof. Schrader, (in a number of works) defended the historicity of the 14th of Genesis. They also accept the development hypothesis.

his-to-ry

Suppose the scientific argument would go far to convince you of the solid ground under the new theory; suppose the linguistic argument is conclusive and you must yield assent. What becomes of history? It is to be held in a Pickwickian sense. W. Robertson Smith said that the writers did not intend to record actual events, but to use the things they wrote in order to convey religious and moral truth.

Deuteronomy is then an innocent deception. Moses's name would give it currency. Some critics make it worse by explaining, "Deuteronomy does not give Moses as author, but as authority". (The lamented A. B. Bruce).

This is precisely wrong. Deuteronomy explicitly gives Moses as author and God as authority. "It was conceived in the spirit of Moses", explains Dr. Driver. But Dr. Driver never read a line from Moses. He declares that the Mosaic authorship of Genesis and Numbers can not be maintained, then he has no data to determine what the spirit of Moses was. This is a great relief to Moses. To speak in the name of God, forbidding any addition to the word; denouncing false prophets; then to add a score of laws; make a false prophecy about a greater prophet; to denounce Israel with terrible threatenings if they depart from these man-made laws; then to impose them upon a young king as divine, is certainly a spirit with which Moses would prefer to have only a most distant acquaintance.

There are men who believe the books to be inspired, to convey good moral and religious instruction after they have punctured the tire of its pretended truthfulness. They can believe that it affirms that God spoke over a hundred times to Moses, when they know that this is all imaginary. They can even affirm that it makes the Bible clearer; that it removes the theories which blocked the way to a better understanding than Jesus and Paul had of the Pentateuch. Pondering how these things can be, if you do not wish to turn over fossils, skip the next section, which closes the argument from archæology.

A Broad Faith.

V. Names as fossils. The successive books of **Jericho Falls on the** the Bible may be pictured as geological strata. **Theory.** The age of a stratum in rock is determined by the fossil remains. The oldest rocks have no remains of life. These are azoic.

The names given to children are an exponent of the knowledge and devotion of the parents. The Pilgrim fathers bestowed Bible names upon their sons and daughters.

Given a confused list of Christian names, some from every generation since the colonization of America, and a Bancroft or a McMasters can arrange them with tolerable accuracy according to time and with some regard to geographical location.

The 4000 names in the Bible form a test of the books. A name becomes a fossil. Jericho furnishes an example. The Pentateuch uses that word. So does Joshua. The writer of Joshua, if not Joshua himself, crossed over the Jordan (5: 1). In the eleven times it is used before the Jordan was crossed, it is spelled Y'rehghoh. But it is spelled Y'reeghoh in the twenty-nine occurrences in Joshua. The explanation is that when the children of Israel came into Canaan, they heard the true pronunciation and changed the writing accordingly. But no one ventured any alteration in that sacred roll in the ark. It has come down to us copied with that scrupulous care which impelled the Hebrew scribes to count the number of letters in order to detect error, and to wipe their pen and take fresh ink before writing the name of God.

That word is a fossil. Tell a geologist that you found a trilobite earlier or later than the Palaeozoic period, and he will wave you off, as did Cuvier the zealous student who reported the discovery of a new muscle in the frog. "Come back in ten years," said Cuvier.

Small as is that added "yod" it is wintry Alps to the hypothesis which would bring Joshua close after Deuteronomy, and both in the 7th century.

The scholarship of the new theory has never been adequate to explain the usage of writers spelling this word one way in the Pentateuch and another in Joshua. Thus JE, two hundred years before Deuteronomy was written, writes Jericho the short way in Deuteronomy 34:3 and the long way in Joshua 2:1. Then P, equally whimsical, living two hundred years after Deuteronomy

and Joshua were written, according to the theory, employed the short form in Numbers 21:1; 26:3, 63; 31:12; 33:48, 50; 34:15; 35:1; 36:13; but in Joshua 4:13, 19; 5:10, he uses the lengthened form. Still worse for the theory, P uses the word the first time it is employed in Deuteronomy 32:49. It is the long form. But only a few chapters further on in Joshua, from the fourth chapter to the twentieth, P has the lengthened form, seven times in all. All the critics agree that Joshua was written soon after Deuteronomy, or at least within a generation. Here are JE against JE and P a stranger to P. A theory is valueless if it does not account for the facts. When a rib was recently found in Kansas, three feet across and eight feet around, no theory could change the conviction of the scientist that Kansas, once had a climate that knew no ice nor snow. That theory, and that alone, can account for that rib. Take the simple and invulnerable history which the Bible gives of itself, and the variation in spelling can be accounted for, in all the instances quoted. The theory is obliged to turn P into a crank, and put JE in the same cell in order to explain the different spelling. Then the explanation is unreasonable. Such scholarship makes itself ridiculous.

For the following we are mainly indebted to
Semitic Names. Prof. Hommel: The three tongues—Babylonian, Arabic, and Hebrew—were from a common stock. The Canaanite and Phœnician were sister tongues.

"Imlik" in Babylonian becomes "yimlock" in Hebrew and "yamlik" in Arabic. "Samshu" is Babylonian, "shemesh" is Hebrew, "samsu" is Arabic—all meaning the sun. "Ni" in Babylonian, "nu" in Hebrew, "ne" in Arabic mean "our".

In South Arabia there are ruins of temples, towns and aqueducts. Their inscriptions show a high state of civilization about 2000 to 1500 B. C. These Semitic people were given to making the name of God a part of the names of their children. An Arabian name on a Babylonian tablet can be detected by the differences noted above. There is only one divine name in South Arabia, "Ten", which is found in names. Other gods came in, but they were inferior and did not receive this honor. This points back to a time when the Arabian was monotheistic. To this agrees the Bible, for Ishmæl was the son of Abraham and the ancestor of some of the peoples in Arabia.

On a Babylonian tablet has been found a royal **Monotheism Ancient**. name, Samsu-ilu-na. This means the sun is our god. But the form is Arabian. It marks a transition to nature worship. Among the names thus formed we have:

My God has presented,
 My God has given,
 My God has created,
 My God has set free,
 My God is resplendent,
 My God shone,
 My God has healed,
 My God is well pleased,
 My God has blessed.

In Genesis 19:25 it is recorded that the earth was divided. This refers to a partition of the earth between Peleg's followers and Joktan's. But Peleg is Hebrew, while Joktan is South Arabian. Then that document was written while the names and the separation were fresh in mind. This favors the suggestion that ancient documents were referred to by Moses in composing Genesis.

These things are subversive of the development theory. For that theory postulates a gradual progress from fetishism through polytheism to the monotheism and spiritual worship of the 8th century B. C. The monuments confirm the biblical history of a departure from primitive monotheism.

Jehovah. Jehovah is an Arabic rather than a Hebrew form. 'Yahveh' is considered by Hebraists to be nearer the correct pronunciation. It is akin to the ancient Arabic verb, "hawayah" (in Hebrew hayah) signifying "to be, to come into existence." This etymology sends its roots back to a time when Hebrew and Arabic had scarcely parted. It came to be pronounced more like yihyeh and in Exodus 3:14 "I AM" is written ehyeh. This form appears in Hosea 1:9, ehyeh lachem, "I will be for you" (with a negative). The true pronunciation is irretrievably lost.

It seems that "Yah" was the earliest form, not an abbreviation.

Before Exodus 6:3 we have only a few names of persons formed with this divine name. **Names Compounded with God.** Jahmia (Jehovah protects) 1 Chron. 7:2, was a grandson of Jacob. Jair (Jehovah enlightens) Num. 32:41. Jochebed (Whose glory is Jehovah), the mother of Moses, Aaron and Miriam.

At a much earlier date we find "el" meaning **El** "God". Before the flood we have Mehujael, (struck by God, or God is combating), a grandson of Cain. Mahalel (praise of God) was a descendant of Seth. Gen. 5:12.

After the flood we find Abimael (my father is God) Gen. 10:28. This is Arabian.

Jehovah. Abraham called his son by Hagar, Ishmael (God hears). His steward was Eliezer (My God helps). Eliphaz (My God is strength) was a son of Esau. Reuel (Friend of God) was also a son of Esau. Eldoah (whom God called) was a Midianite. Eighty-four names are compounded with "el". The list includes nations outside the chosen people, in Cain's line as well as that of Seth, and Ishmael and Esau's sons, Arabian, the same as the Jew. The Midianite and the friends of Job knew "EL". This is not true of "Jehovah". It is found oftener. One hundred and nine names with some compound of Jehovah occur in Hebrew history. It does not appear until after the patriarchs had bequeathed the Messianic promises to their posterity.

Some of these names were very popular. There were eight Jeremiahs (whom Jehovah appointed). Jonathan (whom Jehovah gave) was borne by fourteen. John comes from the Hebrew through the Greek, either from Jonathan or Johanan (Jehovah is gracious).

These one hundred and nine Jehovistic names, by their abundance or scarceness, reveal the esteem in which Jehovah was held. Thus they form a history in themselves. See Note C.

Baal. Specimens of rocks are arranged, with their fossils, in museums, from the earliest strata to the present day. The geologist reads them at a glance. He can readily detect any misplacement. Names

reveal the strata of history. "Baal" offers an additional example. In the cradle Baal was an innocent word. It meant "master", "lord". It was applied to the owner of an ox (Ex. 21:28), or of a house (Ex. 22:7), or to a husband (Ex. 21:22). The Canaanitish language was almost identical with the Hebrew. The word was carried by the Phœnician colony to Carthage, hence we read of Hannibal (grace of Baal), Hasdrubal (aid of Baal). In Babylon the name became "Bel" and is found in proper names.

By the Shechemites he was called Baalberith (Jud. 8:33, the Lord of Covenants). By the Philistines he was called Baalzebub (god of the fly), as if he were a fly destroyer. Gesenius claimed that the planet Jupiter was first worshipped under this title. Later it was sun worship, and joined with Astarte, the moon goddess.

As early as Ex. 14:2 we meet Baalzephon, (lord of Typhon), a place near where Israel crossed the Red Sea. Fifteen places bore the name of Baal. Baaloth (belonging to Baal, Josh. 19:44), is now Balut. Baalhanan (the Lord is gracious), is the first name we meet containing Baal. It is one of the kings of Edom. Eth-baal (living with Baal), was a king of Sidon. The first Jew recorded as bearing the name in the Bible history, is Gideon. He threw down the altar of Baal and cut down the groves or wooden images. The next morning the men urged his father to bring him out to be slain. The old man suggested that if Baal was a god he could plead for himself, and he called his son Jerubbaal (contender with Baal).

In the time of the apostasy, when Israel forgot God and God forsook Shiloh, Saul, future king of Israel, named a son after Baal. Only the best Jews honored Jehovah in those dark days. Samuel named both his sons in praise of Jehovah. One he called Joel (Jehovah is God), the other Abijah (Jehovah is my father). Joab (same meaning) was a nephew of David's. Ahijah (Jehovah is my brother) was a priest. Jonathan, the son of Saul, and a field called Joshua complete the list.

After David became king we find two of his sons, a secretary, and a son of one of his officers bearing a name expressive of regard for Jehovah. This covers more than a century. There are in all

Jews Called After Baal.

Reform.

that time but twelve names with "El" and eleven with some form of Jehovah. But David's zeal kindled the entire nation. He restored the worship of Jehovah, brought the ark to Zion, and set the Mosaic ritual again on its feet. There are enough of the peculiar features of the law and of the furniture of the tabernacle to carry the entire law by logical necessity. That is, if the "altar" is mentioned, we at once know it was used. That obliges sacrifice and the robed priest. This demands a form of worship, a ceremony. So we take it clear through the thirty to forty elements which appear in the days of David and his illustrious son, and like an Alpine avalanche they bury P and his supposed work.

Led by the example of David and by the returning spirit of piety, parents named their children after some form of Jehovah. In the list of singers, priests, Levites and soldiers given in Chronicles, and toward the close of his life work we find nineteen with "El" and thirty-nine honoring Jehovah. (See Note C.)

Strata.

Here are two strata. The fossils are evident. In a time of declension Jehovah was neglected; Baal was honored. Then with the revival of the worship of Jehovah, children begin to wear a name expressive of a prayer, or praise.

This may seem to be very simple. So is any one fact of geology. It is not difficult to understand. Yet like the flakes of snow every one counts in making up an avalanche.

These fossils reveal the age. So in every part of the Old Testament. Hence the chilling attitude of the new school in regard to archæology.

Put a butterfly's wing under the microscope. Its beauty increases with the power of the lens. Place the finest work of art under the glass, and its beauty turns to coarseness. This section is under the microscope. We have gone to Jewish homes and listened while fathers named their children. A century has passed under review. For long years only a prophet or a priest or a king honors God in naming his child. But at the end of the century such names are thick upon the page. Two theories propose to explain. One is of Hebrew extraction, the other of German lineage. The Hebrew theory is very old: the German fresh and vigorous.

Samuel - see all this
Section (5)

The Hebrew declares that names are not mere **Names are History.** tags in the Bible. Every one means something. When a biblical writer used Jehovah, Elohim, Adonai, El Shaddai, El Elyon, or any of the numerous designations of the Deity, he intended to convey an idea. His thought demanded just that word, because it was appropriate to that place or that theme. The paucity of names honoring God, and the fact of a Hebrew child named for Baal in Samuel's day, and the subsequent frequency of names compounded with those of the Deity in the last days of David, are accounted for by the truthfulness of the history. In the early stage priests were bestial. Men abhorred the worship. Sacrilege carried the ark into battle and God forsook Shiloh. The law became to the majority a dead letter.

The reaction under David required years. His example revived faith, hope and worship. Once more God is honored. The name given is a prayer that Jehovah will help or hear or protect, or be a brother or father to the child.

The German theory explains that the variant use of the divine names is simply the choice of the individual writers. One writer preferred Elohim. So did another. These are E1 and E2. Then another chose Elohim up to Ex. 6:3, and after that uses both. Four others were of his mind. These are P1, P2, P3, P4, P5. Another used, "The Lord thy God". He is D. His imitator is D2. There are a number of other writers, but the same monotonous explanation suffices. There are from three to seven Rs, but no critic has ventured to guess what R will do next.

The German theory labors under the disadvantage of variant presentation. Those who denounce the history as incredible are logical. Those who accept its historicity are not. For, if the history be true, the law of Moses in its entirety was given at Sinai, and was the law of Israel.

VI. There is yet another revelation of the **Elaborate Ceremony.** stones, showing that the elaborate system of Moses has its counterpart in the lengthy ritual worship of Egypt, of Phœnicia, of Elam, and of Arabia. With the surrounding nations, some of them Semitic, possessing a

complicated ritual worship, it was perfectly natural for Moses to institute the same.

Burgsch and other Egyptologists have pointed out in Egyptian antiquities many features of the Levitical service. Almost any item of the Mosaic law can be traced to its Egyptian or Accadian home. Then it can be followed in the books written after Moses; up to the exile, with greater fullness and certainty than in the books written subsequently.

The spade has lifted stubborn fortifications against the advance of the theory to acceptance by thinking men.

The complex ritual of surrounding nations removes the last obstacle to Moses's giving the ceremonial law as we read it. This fact marks the development hypothesis as a back number. For it passes from a simpler, more spiritual worship of Deuteronomy, and two hundred years later has the Jew going back to a burdensome and cumbrous ritual. Moreover, this is done in the face of prophetic warnings and pleadings against idolatry and a perfunctory worship. For these sins God wiped Jerusalem as a dish. The real effect was that Israel came back with such a spiritual interpretation of the law that it created the synagogue. The German theory supposes the effect to have been that they wrote out a vast number of ritual observances, and invented the story of the tabernacle and its worship, in order to make their brethren believe that the ritual was written by the authority of God and the hand of Moses.

In the presence of idolatry in its unrestrained form, the Jew felt the immeasurable superiority of the revelation entrusted to him. He did develop, but not backward.

This revelation of the stones also answers the
Moses Could Have pitiful question of Dr. Briggs, "Did Moses give
Written the Law. the books in exactly the form in which we have
 them?" and the assertion of Dr. Driver, that

the ritual law was observed before the exile, but not with the precise formalities of P. There is no fact to show that we do not have the law of Moses substantially as given by him.

Bordering nations had laws as elaborate. Moses was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and there is every reason to believe the simple and consistent report we have in the Pentateuch. This is to descend from the citadel and meet the Ger-

man theory on the ground, as if inspiration did not exist and God never helped.

How do the advocates of the new hypothesis meet the testimony of archaeology? They do not meet it. No volume has come under our notice that grapples with these difficulties. They amount almost to a demonstration. Suppose a writer to never make a mistake in numerous names of places, persons, customs, language and grammar of foreign peoples, and to give a perfectly accurate account six hundred to a thousand years after these things happened, would it not be a miracle? How much more if seven or seventeen individuals accomplished that wonderful feat. This the German theory asks us to believe.

On the other hand the Hebrew walks safely through all these distant days with the eye of an accurate observer, and in the multitude of places, persons and events, where the monuments bear witness, he is never convicted of error. That he wrote legends modified to suit himself, and made up speeches, is assertion without a shred of proof.

Prof. Cheyne says: "Until Schrader and Sayce **Disregard of Proof.** arose, Old Testament critics did not pay much attention to Assyriology. . . . Wellhausen and W. Robertson Smith have in former years displayed an excessive distrust of that study."†

The utter imperviousness to testimony of a stout advocate of the theory is shown by an instance from Wellhausen. The Scriptures say that Manasseh was carried captive to Babylon, where he humbled himself greatly before the Lord, so that he was heard and was restored to his kingdom. It is mentioned only in Chronicles that he was restored. Wellhausen scouted the story. The record stood alone and imperturbable. The stones awoke. The cuneiform inscription of Esarhaddon himself was found, and is now in the British Museum. It confirms the statement of the Chronicler. In spite of this heathen, stony, unalterable witness, Wellhausen refuses to listen, saying: "In truth, Manasseh's temporary deposition is entirely on the same plane with Nebuchadnezzar's temporary grass eating." "Pitiable", says Prof. Terry, "is Wellhausen's attempt to disparage the bearing of the inscription on the question here at

issue". Wellhausen is counted the most brilliant and forcible protagonist of the dominant theory.

Dr. Driver calls Prof. Sayce, "Our foremost English representative of archæology." (*Con. Admission by New School Writer.* Rev. 1894, p. 485). Prof. Sayce wrote in the same periodical: "The belief that Moses wrote the Pentateuch seems to me to involve considerably fewer difficulties than does the contrary belief. . . . I see no reason for denying that the Pentateuch is substantially the work of Moses." He claims that: "From the period before Moses there were documents containing history of the most authentic and trustworthy kind." (*Lex. Mosaica*, p. 11.)

Dr. Driver sweeps past these stubborn witnesses with the declaration that they do not overthrow the critical position. In part, that is true. They do not touch the question as to whether P or J or E or D ever existed. But they confirm the accuracy of the scriptural account wherever they touch it. They present some fossils in the historical strata not explained by the theory. They go far to create distrust in the mild (compared with the German) English characterization of the historical books of the Bible as, in many parts, legends and manufactured speeches. They indicate strongly that the historical insight of the new critic is defective.

However, if in scientific treatment the theory is rigidly accurate, and its argument from language can not be refuted, the twentieth century will take off its hat to the victorious hypothesis.

†Founders of O. T. Criticism, p. 234.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ARGUMENT FROM SCIENCE.

Science embraces all knowledge. "The Subject of science is the human universe. That is to say, every thing that is, or has been, or may be related to man."[†]

"Every department of knowledge is capable of scientific treatment."[‡]

"To say that there are certain fields, *e. g.*, metaphysics, from which science is excluded, wherein its methods have no application, is merely to say that the rules of methodical and the laws of logical thought do not apply to the facts, if any, which lie within such fields. These fields, if indeed any such exist, must lie outside any intelligible definition which can be given to the word *knowledge*. If there are facts, and sequences to be observed among these facts, then we have all the requisites of a scientific classification and knowledge. If there are no facts, or no sequences to be observed among them, then the possibility of all knowledge disappears. There is no short cut to truth, no way to form a knowledge of the universe except through the gateway of scientific methods. The hard and stony path of classifying facts and reasoning upon them is the only way to ascertain truth."[§]

[†]Prof. W. H. Clifford. *Life and Essays*, Vol. I. p. 126.

[‡]Prof. Hofman: *The Sphere of Science*. Preface.

[§]Karl Pearson: *The Grammar of Science*, p. 18.

Defined.

"Science may be defined as exact, verified, systematic knowledge."¶

In strictness all accurate knowledge is science, and all exact reasoning is scientific reasoning. The method of observation and experiment by which great results are obtained is science. It is identical with that which is employed by every one, every day of his life but refined and rendered precise. Scientific observation is at once full, precise, and free from unconscious inference.

"The first requisite of a careful and accurate treatment of any subject is a clear and rational definition of the terms to be employed." "Knowledge", said Demosthenes, "begins with definition."

We add two definitions of science from recent works.

"The classification of facts, the recognition of their sequence and relative significance is the function of science, and the habit of forming a judgment upon these facts, unbiassed by personal feeling, is characteristic of what we shall term the scientific frame of mind."*

"Science may be properly defined as logically arranged and systematized knowledge, or, more fully, that kind of knowledge which consists of facts carefully ascertained, accurately verified, and logically put together into a system."†

Bible vs. Science. It has been the misfortune of the Bible that it has been anchored by its zealous advocates to every obsolescent science.

John Wesley supposed that a belief in witchcraft was essential to acceptance of the Bible. John Calvin held that view in regard to the Ptolemaic astronomy. The deluge was supposed to have been universal. The creation was to be limited to six ordinary days. Moses Stuart thought geology was becoming dangerous, other men once thought that the theory of gravitation would take the control of the worlds out of God's hands.

Under Henry VII of England the lord chancellor, Cardinal Martin, petitioned Parliament to allow money to be loaned at interest. They believed it forbidden in the Bible, and passed a

¶Prof. Chas. W. Shields: The Order of the Sciences, p. 16.

*T. H. Huxley Science Primers, pp. 16, 17.

†Sphere of Science p. 18.

Handwritten:
Hed
Bom
an

law imposing £100 fine, with loss of principal and interest, and punishment by the church. Luther called a man who would take interest a thief.

In the beginning of this century the Scotch **Windmill Theology**. clergy held that windmills were in conflict with "The wind bloweth where it listeth"; that they were also in league with Satan, for he is the prince of the powers of the air. Hence, to erect a windmill was sufficient cause for excommunication.

In 1874 the Church Journal said: "Whether Darwin knows it or not; whether the clergy who are half prepared to accept it in blind fright as 'science', know it or not. Darwinism is a denial of every article of the Christian faith".

Every science whose advent was opposed by a narrow exegesis has enriched our knowledge of God.

It is not by denunciation, nor by refusing to look through Galileo's telescope, nor by predicting ruin to Christianity, that any investigation can be stopped. Every theory which can not endure the scientific crucible is doomed to remorseless electrocution. Thus it should be. Truth is dogmatic. There is but one road to truth. That is by inductive reasoning. The new school takes pride in assertions of fidelity to the scientific method.

New School Scientific. Says Wellhausen: "In all circles where appreciation of scientific results can be looked for at all, it is recognized that it (Deuteronomy) was composed in the same age in which it was discovered".†

Bible no Favors. Kuenen remarks: "We must either cast aside as worthless our dearly-bought scientific method, or must forever cease to acknowledge the authority of the New Testament in the domain of the exegesis of the Old."‡ We are willing to concede this point. In a scientific examination mere authority can not fairly be brought to conflict with rugged facts. In critical investigation, the Bible is to be treated like other books. It can receive no favors. A modern philosopher well says: "If theology is to maintain its

†Prolegomena p. 9

‡Prophets and Prophecy in Israel, p. 487.

claim to be a science it must be a science, it must be in accord with the principles recognized in all science."[§]

Dr. Driver approves of a "strict inductive
Critics Endorse Scientific Methods. method", and "conclusions deduced by sound and legitimate logical processes, from a ground work of solid facts". (Int. preface).

An editorial in the New York Sun said: "The school of biblical criticism to which Dr. Briggs belongs introduced the scientific method of testing the Scriptures, and incidentally every supernatural event and occurrence described in it, and the consequence was necessarily revolutionary.."

Canon Gore says: "The modern development of historical criticism is reaching results as sure, where it is fairly used, as scientific inquiry." He feels that the treatment awarded Galileo should still be remembered by the church.[†]

A voice from the other side speaks clearly:
Conservatives Endorse. "Higher Criticism is but a name for scientific scholarship scientifically used. Where scholarship has the right to enter it has the right to stay, and it can not stay in idleness. What it does and decides may be wrong, but the wrong must be proved by better scholarship."[‡] Thus both contestants, cheerful and confident, appear in the Court of Science, bringing their theories for unflinching examination.

Science, like God, can not be a respecter of persons. Her rules must impartially measure the mental productions submitted.

The pens of Aristotle, Bacon, Whewell, J. S. Mill, Jevons and others have shaped the axioms of the inductive method.
Axioms Five.

1. In deductive reasoning we can not have any truth in the conclusion which is not virtually contained in the premises.[§]

Prof. Shields says: "The hypothesis should be based on the facts—not on ideas which the hypothesis involves. It should fully reflect all the distinct classes of facts which have been scientifically ascertained."

[§]Pfeiderer: New World 1898, 413.

[†]Lux Mundi, p. 298.

[‡]Principal A. M. Fairbairn.

[§]Whewell, Philosophy of the Inductive Science, Aphorisms, p. 19.

Facts to Be Observed.

"It can not be too strongly emphasized that the foundation of all science is facts. It matters not whether they be material facts or immaterial facts . . . there can be no science without facts. But before the facts can be used in the formation of science they must, first of all, be critically examined. Given an exact knowledge of the facts, something more is necessary in order to make a science. The facts known must be capable of verification."[¶]

Not inferences, not theories, but facts, cold facts, verifiable facts, are the first requisite.

2. Next is classification.**Classification.**

"The first aim of any genuine work of science, however popular, ought to be the presentation of such a classification of facts that the reader's mind is irresistibly led to acknowledge a logical sequence, a law which appeals to the reason before it captivates the imagination. Let us be quite sure that whenever we come across a conclusion in a scientific work which does not flow from the classification of facts, or which is not directly stated by the author to be an assumption, then we are dealing with bad science. . . . The scientific method is one and the same in all branches, and that method is the one adopted by all logically trained minds."^{*}

"There is no science unless the facts have also been arranged into classes. . . . The ultimate ground of all classification is likeness." "Any facts which can not be put into some class with other facts can not belong to a science."

"No hypothesis should be accepted as probably a true one that leaves out of consideration any of the facts."

"A single absolute conflict between a fact and hypothesis, destroys the hypothesis at the outset."[†]

"In science it is assumed that all facts have significance, else they would not exist. All the known facts must be embraced. The theory which knowingly omits facts is unscientific."[‡]

[¶] Sphere of Science, p. 4, 5.

^{*} Grammar of Science, pp. 12, 13.

[†] Sphere of Science, p. 4.

[‡] Grammar of Science, p. 12, 13.

A Theory Must Be Needed. 3. "Of hypotheses in general we may say that all attempts to establish a new hypothesis are to be abandoned, if hypotheses already in existence equally well explain all the facts. We

have no right whatever to introduce a new hypothesis unless we have some facts that are new and unaccounted for, or unless the known effects are only in part explained by existing causes."[§]

The hypothesis emerges as soon as the facts are classified. Usually the first hypothesis fails to account for all the facts, and another is proposed. It is no dishonor to bring forward a new hypothesis.

Verifications. 4. "No hypothesis should be entertained that will not allow of sure and ready deduction. If no conclusions could be formed from an hypothesis, it could never be verified, and an hypothesis that could not be verified would be of no use whatever."[¶]

This is prophecy. Science can foretell. Given certain data, *c. g.*, hydrogen two parts, oxygen one part and an electric spark. The result will be water, invariably.

5. "Finally, in order to have a science, the facts that have been fully ascertained, thoroughly verified and carefully arranged into classes, must be put together into a system. Nothing short of this will give a science."^{*}

There are two tests stated by J. S. Mill. The method of agreement says: "Whatever can be eliminated is not connected with the phenomena by law." The method of difference: "Whatever can not be eliminated is connected with the phenomena by a law."

Evolution is an accredited principle in science that must be reckoned with.

Measurement. Science is not content unless accurate. David Starr Jordan, president of Leland Stanford Jr. University, says: "The value of generalization lies in statistical tables."

In his "Ideality of Science", Prof. Benj. Pierce, one of the ablest mathematicians of the century, says: "If any one would

[§]Sphere of Science, p. 5.

[¶]Sphere of Science, p. 54.

^{*}Sphere of Science, p. 51.

look into my work-shop, he would see books filled with figures, the nine digits; that is the work of science."

Whatever is hazy is distasteful to science. Quantitative analysis is the triumph of research, while mere opinions refuse to be aligned in the mathematical precision which science seeks.

Facts Wanted.

The first axiom of science is that facts are absolutely essential to establish a theory. With this demand the conservative promptly complies. He brings forth the 137 assertions that God spoke to Moses, and says the fact that these things are written can not be questioned. He submits the repeated declarations that Moses wrote the law, the journeys of the children of Israel, all the words of Jehovah, his statutes, his judgments and commandments, etc.; then claims that there is no room to wedge in anything else. Another fact he submits, that no one else is ever said to have written anything in the Pentateuch, and that the testimony of the Old Testament, and that of the New, perfectly agree with his position. He further has the audacity to say that, aside from vehement assertion, the radical has no fact whatever for the scientific investigator. We do not accept that one-sided statement, for the new school has a right to bring in its facts.

Dr. Briggs, honestly accepting the history as reliable, quotes the Scriptures which affirm Mosaic authorship, and bravely adds: "We

shall now consider some passages of the Hexateuch which tell a different story."

That would be a very important fact, if he could show it. But while lavish in promise, he is bankrupt when he attempts to redeem. The only fact that he submits from the Pentateuch is a poetical extract. Num. 21:14. "Wherefore it is said in the wars of the Lord Vaheb in Suphah, and the valleys of Arnon.

Moses may have been the writer of that book—viz: "The wars of the Lord",—or he may have have quoted from it, or an amanuensis may have slipped it in. Does it say that Moses did not write the law? Does it suggest that this was not written till about the year 800 B. C., and then by J or E? Dr. Briggs is an expert. He has studied the analytical hypothesis since 1866. He

+Briggs: Hexateuch, p. 11.

asserts with all the confidence of German scholarship. He brings forth proof with all that painful lack of pertinency and factual foundation that makes American science groan. He quotes Joshua 10:12, 13 and 24:26, which, as has been shown, come as near to asserting that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, as the moon does to striking the earth.

Prof. Kittell of Breslau blandly informs us, ‡“the assertion that Moses wrote the Pentateuch can not be proved. To a superficial observation some passages of the Pentateuch appear to assert that Moses wrote the whole, but a more searching inquiry immediately dissipates the idea. Those passages never speak of any thing beyond individual sections of the whole.” Still, Dr. Kittell ought to admit that if the sections include the whole, as they do, then Moses was the author of the Pentateuch.

The fact that the record says Moses wrote the law, crushes all fancies that he did not. Some fact alone can stand against this fact. The word “the” is stronger than all speculations.

A critic ought certainly to know the law of words. “The” is an emperor. It appears in no savage tongue. It never merges into view until a nation is capable of abstract thought. Then it is despotic. It excludes everything else and reigns alone. “The law” is one. It is not “codes”, for “the law” was never codified. It is not five books, for this is an artificial division, as human as the separation into verses and chapters. Then words in ancient literature are to be understood in the sense in which they were used by the writers.

Science can have no prejudice against the Bible. Nor can it show any favoritism. Fairness demands that this be treated like other books. We accept the statements of ancient authors in other works, unless the declaration is incredible, even to the verge of impossibility, or it is disproved by other testimony.

When the things which Moses is said to have written are deducted from the Pentateuch, only a few chapters in the begin-

‡Kittell: History of the Hebrews, Vol. I, p. 28.

ning of Genesis and the last chapter of Deuteronomy are unassigned.

Hobbes, in his *Leviathan*, said that Moses may have written the central part of Deuteronomy; the 11th, to the 27th. Dr. Kittel gives Moses 5 to 26 inclusive. Spinoza thought that Ezra wrote all the five books. The French school claims that they were written after the captivity.

Lack of Facts.

Are they not all mere individual opinions offering no fact with which science can deal? Dr.

Kittel is as sure that the Pentateuch was written before the exile as Dr. Driver is positive that it was not. Each can point to a respectable list of scholars who claim that modern scholarship is theirs.

History by Fancy.

Dr. Kittel is a modern historian of the Jews. If his intuition be infallible, Abraham was a myth, the twelve sons of Jacob a figment of the imagination, and the origin of Israel was a confederation of wandering tribes. Knowing so much that has no historical data, he can say: "The legal part of the Hexateuch puts it beyond doubt that the laws were neither written by one author nor at the same time." (p. 29).

Moses Knew Some things.

The history says they were not written at the same time. Moreover, it expressly declares that, by the command of God, Moses wrote a covenant in Moab besides the covenant which he made in Horeb, nearly forty years before. In that new covenant, made under different circumstances, for a people about to change from a nomadic to a settled life, there are a score of new laws, Some were never made before, some modified previous legislation, some sanction and refer to the laws made at Horeb. To say that Moses, after rearing a new generation, at the close of forty years' experience, could not modify his legislation so that it would be better adapted to the changed condition, may be believed in Germany, but it will not pass current in America.

Deuteronomy Changed Laws.

Our legislatures meet biennially and change the laws of the previous session, so that the next legislature will have something to do.

The terminology changes with time, and the Hebrew love for

synonyms is strong. "Aaron and his sons" may be more fully expressed by "the priests the Levites". The three feasts to which attendance was compulsory are named in Exodus and Deuteronomy, while Leviticus and Numbers add four which were voluntary. The Passover was first observed in Egypt in totally different circumstances from those in which it was afterward celebrated in Canaan. If this receives recognition in Deuteronomy 16, there is no necessity for creating a new law-giver. With a varied experience like that of Moses through forty years, any man, rude or educated, would change his thought and diction. To base on such flimsy straws the affirmation, "it is utterly impossible to speak of a unity of the whole law-giving, so far as time and author are concerned", is to ignore the fact that the record does not speak of a unity of time, but allows a full generation to pass away. Ezra and all the biblical writers from that time to the end of the New Testament speak of a unity of the law. The impossibility did not exist for them. Since Dr. Kittel holds that the law was completed before the exile, it follows that Isaiah, in all probability, and Jeremiah held the view declared to be impossible.

Dr. Driver asserts: "The Mosaic authorship of **Feeling as a Substitute for Facts.** Genesis and Numbers can not be sustained". This, like Dr. Briggs's confident affirmation, is important if true. Dr. Driver's proof is brief. "Can any one read the injunctions respecting sacrifices and feasts in Ex. 23:14-19, beside those in P, (Lev. 1-7, Num. 28-29, for instance) and not feel that some centuries must have intervened between the simplicity which characterizes the one and the minute specialization which is the most of the other?"

Strict fidelity to history, Doctor, compels us to say that some of the brainiest men in England have done that. Dr. Pusey and Bishop Lightfoot stood in the foremost ranks of Hebrew scholars. They considered this question and did not feel that centuries must have elapsed. Dean Alford, a most accomplished scholar, did not feel it. Principal Wace, Canon Girdlestone, Prof. Stanley Leathes, Canon Spencer, Canon Cook, Alfred Cave, and dozens of the soundest thinkers of Great Britain are men whose depths of feeling were undisturbed by these supposed centuries.

Feeling, then, does not decide it. The feeling of W. E. Gladstone is as deep and valuable as that of S. R. Driver. Science, in the appropriate place, considers feeling, but now is demanding facts.

No Conflict in the Bible.

Suppose that a grammar states: "Pronouns are divided into personal, interrogative, demonstrative, relative and indefinite." Several pages later the relative pronouns are explained in detail. Does the latter composition require another author, or a later century?

A constitution declares that the officers shall be president, vice president, etc. Further along, or in the by-laws, the duties of each officer are defined. Does that demand two minds, or a long interval?

The analogy is exact. Ex. 23:14-19, in a few verses, declares that there shall be three compulsory feasts. It has only one line in regard to sacrifice. Then Lev. 1-7 has no reference to Ex. 23:14-19. It is wholly occupied with directions to the priests in regard to various offerings. (It is possible that Dr. Driver made a mistake in the reference, for Lev. 23 gives more specific directions concerning feasts.) Numbers 28-29 contain the ceremonies to be observed in the feasts, which are named in general, in Ex. 23:14-19. To say that this fuller detail demands another writer is unworthy of Dr. Driver's scholarship.

Any man able to read the English Bible, who will take the trouble to follow the references, will usually be disappointed by the chasm between the proposition and the text. Here the proposition is that Moses could not have written Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. The proof is that Exodus states in brief, general terms, what Numbers fully specifies. Therefore, centuries must have intervened.

One Man Writing General and Specific Laws.

Again, science is chagrined. There is no fact: only an illogical inference that one man could not write a general law and then give specific directions as to its observance.

Dr. Driver thinks the same Moses could not have written Ex. 20:24b, "in every place where I record my name I will come unto thee and bless thee", and Deuteronomy 12-5, 14, 18, which declares that God will choose one place in

(Canaan to which they must come with their offerings. Does not the Professor overlook:

(a). Time? The first is before the law was given. Facing the Israelites is the desert and forty-years wandering.

(b). Place? On the edge of the Red sea, dwelling in tents, that is Exodus. Deuteronomy gives the law as it will be in the promised land.

(c) Conditions? A nomadic, murmuring, untrained horde of rescued slaves, and (that generation having passed to their graves) a disciplined, organized, loyal and educated nation. In Deuteronomy the nation is contemplated as about to settle, to abide for centuries. In Exodus they were to wander, and the sanctuary would be removed from place to place.

Imaginary Troubles of the Critic. It seems singular that Dr. Driver should overlook such great differences in circumstances. But the Doctor is confirmed in the belief that

Moses did not write both, because from Joshua to I Kings 6, "sacrifices are frequently described as offered in different parts of the land without any indication, on the part of either the actor or the narrator, that a law such as that of Deuteronomy is being infringed." (Int. p. 85).

After excluding uncertain or exceptional cases. **Driver's References.** the Dr. refers to Josh. 24:1b, 26b (no altar at all—v. 2). But it was a witness, i. e., a memorial stone. I Sam. 7:9-17 is his next reference. (Samuel was a prophet. He, as well as Moses, was under the direction of the Lord. He was a Levite. He may have had a priest to assist him. The altar he built at Ramah, may not have been for sacrifice, but a memorial.)

Then he quotes I Sam. 9:12-14. In the next verse it is said: "Now the Lord had revealed unto Samuel". A prophet with whom God was in constant communication would not be offering sacrifices contrary to God's will. There are three ways in which this can be reconciled with the known existence of the law of Moses.

(a). God can suspend his own law.

(b). The people had forsaken God, and he was chastising them as a nation, though individuals yet worshipped him.

See
Page 1

many
places
cordie
while
travel
and m
Settle
only
place

Rever
in ov
nech
follow
negot
place
man
+

(c). The time for carrying the provisions of Deuteronomy into effect was drawing near, but had not yet come.

All three of these are true.

Again he refers to I Sam. 10:3-5-8. These tell **Many Altars.** of Saul meeting prophets, and that Samuel would come and offer sacrifices when Saul would be make king. Samuel called the people together unto the Lord, to Mizpah. If he called them unto the Lord, then the Lord must have been there.

Dr. Driver connects this reference with 13:9f, but the latter was two years later, and very different. There Saul was presumptuous, and offered the sacrifice before Samuel came. Samuel rebuked him.

I Sam. 11:15 is another. Twice are their sacrifices said to be before the Lord. They were under Samuel. They were to permanently install Saul as king, which God had revealed to Samuel. This does not prove that no law existed.

I Sam. 14:35: Saul built an altar unto the Lord. A priest was there. God answered not. Saul had disobeyed. This implies a known law.

I Sam. 20:26: A yearly sacrifice at Bethlehem for a family. Feasting followed the offering. Gesenius connects this with 9:13, 16:3, where Samuel offered sacrifice by command of the Lord.

II Sam. 15:12-32 is still another. Absalom told his father he was going to Hebron to offer sacrifices. His offering was that of a wicked man. Verse 22 tells that David was accustomed to worship God on the Mount of Olives. So Daniel, in Babylon, turned his face toward Jerusalem. It is not said that he offered sacrifice there.

Such is the list given to prove that the law in Deuteronomy was not yet given. If any cause can be fairly assigned for the abnormal observances, or for the non-observance of the law at one altar, it would explain these local sacrifices. Two causes are given.

1. A law seldom goes into effect immediately on its passage. Time is given from which it is binding. So with the law in Deuteronomy 12. It is to go into effect "When the Lord your God giveth you rest from all your enemies round about, so that ye shall dwell in safety". "Then it shall come to pass that in the

Good
what
law
d

And
David
more

W

place which the Lord your God shall choose to cause his name to dwell there", etc. (Deut. 12:10, 11).

All of Dr. Driver's quotations of sacrifice (except Absalom's) are in a time when Israel was yet in turmoil. David took Jerusalem. He conquered a peace. Not till that time did they have rest and dwell safely from all their enemies. So the law in Deuteronomy, by its own stipulation, was not binding in Samuel's day.

2. Moreover, the forsaking of God's altar by the people, caused by the vileness of Eli's sons, led to the forsaking of Shiloh by God. Samuel was spoken to by God when a little boy, and all Israel knew that he was established to be a prophet. He remained faithful. God directed him to the day of his death. When God commanded him to go and sacrifice at Bethlehem, Saul did not consider it unusual, showing that local sacrifices were known. These things are sufficient to reconcile the practice of that day with the existence of the entire law.

When the new hypothesis presents a formidable obstacle to the theory of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, then it will have furnished a fact which science can handle.

Undoubtedly it is a fact that in Samuel's time the law was not fully observed. That is compatible with the new theory that the law was not yet given, or was known only in part. But it is also compatible with the explanation given above. So there is not yet one clear, solid, unquestionable fact upon which to base the propositions, "Moses did not write the law", "J, E, H, P, and R1, R2, R3, R4 did".

Dr. Dillman presents an argument which is also a large portion of the capital of Kittel and Kuenen. Dr. Driver has less confidence in it, and Dr. Briggs still less. They allege repetitions, double accounts, irreconcilable statements and chronological contradictions. The learned author says: "They are not explicable on the assumption that the book was composed as a unity." He refers to Genesis, where nearly all are located.

The professor might have added that they are not reconcilable on his hypothesis, with the supposition that R had half sense. For by any theory the narratives in Genesis came down from the early morn-

Was R Sane?

invariant - stage of
Israel - Mosaic law
Settled

ing of history, and were composed by some one. If he put together such a confused and contradictory mess as that argument claims, he certainly had not the mental capacity of the ordinary tramp.

For example, the critic of the theory says that the second chapter of Genesis is a discrepant account of creation. That is his assertion; what is the fact? The chapter never intimates any such suggestion. Its title is clearly given—"generation", not "creation". It makes no mention of the creation of light, air, stars, ocean, sun, moon, or of any life in the water, nor of insects, nor reptiles. It is not probable that any man would write that, as an account of creation. It tells of Eden, of rivers, marriage, geography, home, law, lessons in speech, but nowhere implies that the writer is trying to give an account of creation. However, if that was his aim, and R was dull enough to pin it on the first without discovering it was a discordant story, then R was not troubled with imbecility. He had it too deep to be troubled.

There is no suggestion that this chapter is an
An Inspired Fool. account of creation. It is a direct step to the next chapter, the most important of the Old Testament, the fall of man. Dr. Briggs assures us that the redactors were inspired. If so, and this be an account of creation, a man with good sense would pray to be saved from inspiration.

The real account of creation is so compact, so accurate, that Gladstone said to Prof. Huxley, that he, with all his scientific knowledge, could not in the same space, write a better description. The professor did not try. But would it be safe to challenge a high-school boy to write a better story of creation than the second chapter?

The Creator has concealed his purpose if he inspired men to give the world two discrepant accounts of creation, side by side. But if the second chapter, as its title indicates, be an account of the offspring of earth and heaven, even man, then it is a link in the sublime revelation of God's eternal plan. It most forcibly and beautifully tells the story of man's probation. Call it a parable, or an epic, or a myth, if you will. No man has suggested a more appropriate or satisfactory explanation of our tears.

This hints at the source of misinterpretation. **Unsympathetic Critics** Sympathy is essential in interpretation. Spinoza, Hobbs, Paine and Voltaire generated and nurtured this style of argument. They would see contradictions and discrepancies where a clearer vision, anointed with faith, would behold order and beauty. But contradictions and confusion are in harmony with the theory of different authors; hence, this argument has, with reckless haste, accepted the entire bunch. This also explains why Driver, and more emphatically Briggs, do not copy all.

Negation is always weak. Those unbelievers **Unbelief Weak.** were strong thinkers. Their attack on the Bible is weak from want of facts. So these discrepancies and contradictions are imaginary. Every one has been met and answered a thousand times. They must be met a thousand times more. For the skeptic has no other artillery. It is unfortunate that Christian scholars should take up such foolish arguments. It brings upon them the disrespect which weakness invites in dialectics.

The next charge brought by Dr. Dillman is, † **Antique Objections.** There are found in it all sorts of seemingly needless repetition:

Gen. 4:25f with 5:1-6

Gen. 21:1a with 21:1b

Gen. 47:29bf with 49:29ff

The race had its childhood. Repetition is natural to children. It is needed in teaching. To file an objection to the way in which a Hebrew of the desert wrote history, is to ask that the child shall speak like a man.

The Hebrew delighted in parallels. The Psalms **Repetition Does Not** and Proverbs are crowded with them. He was **Prove Two Authors** rich in synonyms. He had four words for "sun", five for "lion", seven for "sleep", a dozen for "terror". Though he repeated, he always added something in the second clause.

"And the Lord visited Sarah as he had said, and the Lord did

†Dillman's Genesis, p 4 ff.

unto Sarah as he had spoken." To the Hebrew ear, this was beautiful. He enjoyed the rythm. Now a coarse, half-educated man, like Paine, or a reckless, well-educated man like Voltaire, comes to that to find fault. It is seemingly a needless repetition; it was therefore written by two different men. The analysis led to that uncanny source for arguments, gravely asserts that J wrote the first half, then four hundred years later P, in Babylon, wrote the second half. It is rather queer. P writes: "God remembered Abraham and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when he overthrew the cities in which he dwelt. And the Lord did unto Sarah as he had spoken, at the set time of which God had spoken to him." There is a brake in the narrative if P wrote the above yet, the analysis assigns it to him. A chapter and a half come between "dwelt" and the next next words; but that portion is given to J and E. This turns scripture into nonsense.

Gen. 4:25-26 and 5:1-6 both name the children of Adam. The method and end attained are different. One tells of their devotion, the other of their relation to the family of mankind—a part of the history of the race.

In Gen. 47:29-31 Jacob has Joseph to swear that he will bury him in Caanan. In 49:29-31 he charges all his sons to bury him in the cave of Machpelah. This is supposed by these sober critics to have required two distinct writers: On what ground? "A needless repetition." There may have been years between the two events. That both did not occur is the quiet assumption. But suppose that the old man did speak to Joseph with the solemnity of an oath, and to his sons with the sanction of the dying hour. The two-fold charge reveals the hold the patriarch had on Caanan and would be valuable as national history. It would foster patriotism. The repetition is not slavish. It would be natural to an aged man. It is a harsh interpretation to say that one man could not have spoken twice in regard to his burial place, or that one writer could not have recorded both in different phraseology. No other book is treated so unkindly.

A subdivision is created where there are "two Opinion vs. History. or more accounts of the same thing"; e. g., the the seizure of the patriarch's wife (12:10f. and 20:1f. and 26:7f). This is an instance of "Things equal to the

3 stories of Abraham and his wife Sarah seized 3 different times

same thing are equal" changed by the argument to read, "Things not equal to the same thing are equal to each other". The custom of taking fair women for the harem of the king, is well attested. Dillman himself says (Genesis, p. 19): "Similar stories are told by modern travelers of Oriental kings who, quite at their own pleasure, introduce into their harem the beauties of their land. An old Egyptian story of the same kind is given by Ebers."

The three events occurred in an interval of eighty-five to one hundred years. Each story differs from the others. Since they are not equal in persons, time, place, nor circumstances, the hypothesis says they are equal to each other; that is, the three are one story: that such an event could not happen twice to Abraham and once to Isaac in a century. J is supposed to have written two and E one. It is a choice between a German opinion and an inspired writer. The account of Sarah's driving Hagar away before Ishmael was born (16:1f), and that of Abraham's sending Hagar and Ishmael away thirteen years afterward, are said to be the same thing. The two covenants God made with Abraham (15 and 17) are thought to be identical. The story of Jacob's securing the blessing of Isaac (27:1f), and the brief farewell blessing when he sent him to Padan-Aram (28:1-4), are treated as two accounts of the same event. The promise of a son to Sarah (17:17 and 18:10f), are supposed to have required two men for their recording. The circumstances differ. How can a critic of today know that both did not happen? He evolves it from his inner consciousness. The reader must choose between the ancient witness and the modern scholar.

"The triple explanation of the name Isaac, (17:17, 18:12, 21:6)", is another misleading clause. In not one of these passages is the name mentioned. (There is a coincidence. "Isaac" means "laughter".) In the three quotations Abraham or Sarah is said to have laughed, as aged people would at the idea of having a child. In no sense does this claim to be the explanation. The best refutation is to be found in a careful reading of the passages.

Again we are told of "The double explanation of the name Edom (Gen. 25:25, 30)." Verse 25 says he was called Esau, meaning hairy. Verse 30 calls him Edom, or red. The lentiles

were red. Orientals change names easily. There is no double explanation of the name Edom.

Then come the accounts "which mutually exclude each other, because the thing could have happened once or in one way; e. g., on the sequence of creation, chapters 1 and 2". They do exclude each other, but they are on totally different themes. One is labelled "Creation", the other "Generation".

Another example is in "The number of animals taken into the ark". The direction is given in general, two of every sort. One hundred and twenty years later the specific directions include seven of each kind of clean, but only two of the unclean. How two of the unclean can exclude seven of the clean, Dr. Dillman does not inform us.

For another example he instances "the duration of the flood". It is clearly stated when **An Instance of "Scholarly Criticism"** Noah went into the ark and when he came out, a year and ten days. What if a man with his sharp scissors should cut out one verse and read (7:24), "And the waters prevailed upon the earth one hundred and fifty days", then should insist that the Bible taught in one place six months, and in another a year and ten days, would you call that scholarship?

In the analytic account of the flood the writers change twenty-three times, according to our critics. That is, J wrote an imperfect account of the flood, making it last about one hundred days. Four hundred years later P wrote his account. Then R clipped these two into bits, sometimes half verses, and put them together, but so unskillfully that the critics of today can detect the joints, even to pulling out two words in one place and assigning them to another writer.

Following are the remaining supposed contradictions discovered by the keen eyes of the critic:

Imagined Contradictions.

(a). The general description of the dispersion of the sons of Noah, chapter 10, and the special line followed in chapter 11; the naming of the well Beersheba, 21:31, and the renaming by Isaac fifty years later, 26:18-33. Isaac dug them out after the Philistines had filled them, and he "called their

names after their names by which his father had called them". Two writers are needed, one when Abraham digged the well, the other when Isaac cleaned them out.

(b). The naming of Israel at night, 32:29, and the ratification publicly, 35:10.

(c). The naming of a spot Bethel by Jacob, 28:18, and the recognition of that name by God, 35:1-14.

(d). The encounter with the Shechemites (34), and the allusion to it in a single verse by the dying Jacob many years afterward.

(e). The treatment of Joseph by his brethren and that by the merchants (37:19-36).

The same creative imagination beholds other things, which, to its vision, are irreconcilable. The reduction of man's life to one hundred and twenty years (6:3), he puts over against Chapter 5:11. This latter gives the age of Enos as 905, while 6:3 states the time of probation till the deluge. The passages do not need reconciliation, for they are on separate topics and at different times.

That Abraham, after the death of Sarah, still begat many sons (25:1f), he opposes to 18:11. Unfortunately for Abraham's good name and the eager critic's argument, the record does not say "after the death of Sarah". He may have taken Keturah in Hagar's stead. The "many" were six.

"That Esau, on Jacob's return from Mesopotamia, was already settled in Seir (32:4f), against 36:6," is another of his irreconcilables. This is a most glaring perversion. Esau was a great hunter. He made incursions into Seir, and gathered a band of four hundred men like himself. Not a word is said in 32 of Esau's being settled in Seir, while 36:6, which describes Esau's removal, does not tell the time.

"That Rebecca's nurse first comes from Mesopotamia with Jacob 35:8 (nothing of the kind is said—her death is recorded at that time), he puts against 24:59" (she came with Rebecca).

"That all the sons of Jacob were born in Padan-Aram (35:26) against verse 16f". The record does not say "all". The birth of Benjamin had just been described. The critic should remember:

(a). The Hebrew did not write history just as **The Hewbrews Did** we do.
Not Write Like We do. (b). The writer having stated the one exception, hoped the reader would remember the birth of Benjamin.

(c). The entire time of the journey, the sojourn and the return is referred to Padan-Aram.

The different names of Esau's wives (26:34, 28:9) against 36:2-3, is fully explained by the Oriental custom of changing names readily. 42:27 says one of Jacob's sons opened his sack and found his money in it. Verse 35 says they all did. But in 43:21, their report to Joseph's steward, they do not go into details, but give the essential fact. It is not minutely accurate, unless, as Wellhausen claims, all opened their sacks at the inn; but it was substantially true.

The critics imagine, also, some chronological difficulties. 12:4 with 12:11, 20:2f. That is, Sarah would not be beautiful when old, or retain a youthful appearance. But Charles Anthon showed that Helen of Troy must have been one hundred and twenty when Troy was besieged.

Ishmael, at thirteen, (17:24, 21:5, 8), against 21:15f, is supposed to have been too large to be cast under the shrubs by his mother when dying with thirst.

Another of the same kind is that Isaac (27:1-7) **Weak Fancies.** thought he would die soon. He lived to be one hundred and eighty. This is supposed to be impossible; *i. e.*, that a man should live many years after he thought he would soon die. Therefore two men must have written conflicting stories of the patriarch, and R had not the judgment to see the contradiction. Now if it should be possible for a woman to retain youthful beauty to old age, or for a sick boy to be laid under a shade, or for an old man to expect death a quarter of a century before it comes, then science is yet empty handed as to facts furnished by this hypothesis.

"Indeed narratives are even to be met with in which particular parts do not agree with the rest; *e. g.* Gen. 31:48-50". Only three verses. They describe the heap of stones erected by Jacob and Laban. Both Dr. Dillman and Dr. Driver give the entire passage to J. Dr. Dillman makes some transpositions. Dr.

Wellhausen says it was erected at a time when there was war between Syria and Israel.

If it does not agree then two writers are supposed to be necessary. But the analysis does not support the commentary. This passage has been assigned to E1, E2, J, JE and to R, every critic in turn being sure he was right. In any case it has a man contradicting himself. The contradiction is imaginary.

"The conclusion does not agree with the beginning. (Gen. 24:67)." He is right. Isaac went out to meditate. Rebecca came just at that time. That stopped the meditation. He took her to his tent and was comforted after his mother's death. Why this should require two writers is so plain to a new critic that the reason is not stated. To us it is eisegesis.

Such are the arguments employed to show that Genesis is not a unity; that there were two writers. In no one instance is that supposition necessary. In most cases it is violent. In every example it is arbitrary.

The theory carries on this creation of discrepancies and imagination of two writers in Exodus and Numbers. It exists only in the mind of the seer. Another critic will fail to see it or will assign it differently.

It is difficult to catch the point at issue. If it be repetition, that is not denied. There are numerous repetitions in Genesis 24, yet that is given entirely to J.

The visit and report of the spies (Num. 13 and **Freedom of Fancy.** 14) are badly shattered by the analysis. These two chapters are composed of eighteen fragments. That is, P wrote sixteen and one-half verses, JE finished that half verse and wrote three more. P then wrote a verse, J wrote three, P a verse and a half, then J half a verse and five more. P then wrote half a verse and a verse, and thus to the end. J or E each lived one hundred years before the other, according to the critics. When they two together write half a verse, then, four hundred years later, P writes the first part of it, then is brought to pass the saying of the prophet Briggs, "It is necessary to distinguish D and D2, J and J2, E and E2, and thus the problem of Pentateuchal criticism becomes complex and extremely intricate." (Hex., p. 138.)

After this arbitrary and unnecessary separation the opposition of partial statements in each is an easy task.

We read: "So they went up and spied out the land from the wilderness of Zin unto Rehob, to the entering in of Hamath. And they went up by the south and came to Hebron, and the children of Anak were there."

The wilderness of Zin was east of the Jordan. Rehob was north probably near the northern border. Hamath was the northern boundary of Israel. They ascended from the south, stopping at the important city of Hebron in their journey.

Dr. Driver cuts this description in two, and makes JE tell: "They went only to Hebron." P wrote the preceding part and sent the spies to the north. Driver seems to believe that JE, living about 800 B. C., thought that a visit to an extreme southern city by men from the south was spying the land. Dr. Driver is evidently not a logician, or he would not contradict himself so often. After making JE stop at the border, he has him saying: "The land through which we have gone." Again, JE murmurs, and declares that the Lord has brought them to be devoured by the sword. He proposes to make a captain and return to Egypt, and upsets all that by saying, "If the Lord delight in us, then he will bring us into this land". JE also reports a fertile land and exhibits the fruit of it. "But," says the same JE, "it is a land which eateth up the inhabitants thereof," which Driver says means "impoverished". It really means the opposite. Lev. 26:38 and Ezek. 36:12, 13 show that when a land is fertile it invites incursions of enemies, who eat up the inhabitants.

Thus a versatile scholar slices up the history into contradictions and nonsense. Read it. Picture it. Consider the varying reports of the courageous and the fearful, to both Moses and the people, and it is evident that the modern critic has to read difficulties into it. Is this not to inflict sophistry on one's self? There is no fact which renders it impossible for Moses to have written that account. The omission of Joshua's name where Caleb is mentioned (13:30, and 44:24) may have risen from Moses's deep affection for Joshua, which took it for granted that his loyalty would be understood.

We have fully compassed this class of objections, which form so large a portion of the capital of the new theory. There is abundance of opinion, but no fact interposing a tangible obstacle to the Mosaic authorship.

An infinite number of ciphers added together do not amount

to the least fraction, nor do a million of opinions form one fact, except the fact that such opinions are held.

True, if there were two discordant histories of creation, or of the sending of the spies, a stupid redactor could have put one by the side of the other, or telescoped one into the other.

If the sun were the size of the earth, and a million of miles distant, and revolved around the earth every twenty-four hours, it would appear just the size it does now. It would rise and set, in the same way as at present. That solar theory is not true, although appearances coincide with it. Nor is the new hypothesis true because some things can be reconciled to it.

If we have not been so foolish as to quote only **No Fact for Science.** the weaker arguments—foolish, because it is unjust and merits the defeat it invites—then the scientific argument ends at the threshold.

There is not one fact for a basis for scientific investigation. That is, there is no fact which justifies either the denial of the Mosaic authorship or the assertion that the Hexateuch was written by a multitude of authors. There are plenty of suppositions, but an absence of facts. To make this clear, take an example: It is a fact that the first two chapters of Genesis both record creative acts. It is a fact that the new school claim that each is a record of creation, and, secondly, that they were written by two different men. The last two are assumptions. They are not indubitable facts. They are contested.

Put in contrast the first assertion of the traditional school. The Pentateuch frequently asserts Mosaic authorship. That is indubitable. The only answer is that it does not assert it for the completed work. Omitting the final chapter of Deuteronomy and some few additional copyist's notes, the traditional view has such assertion, *i. e.*, "Moses wrote this law", "when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book until they were finished" (Dt. 31:9-24). These affirm the writing of the Pentateuch. This is a fact. Such fact as that the new hypothesis does not possess. There is no fact which is unquestionably irreconcilable with the Mosaic handwriting. There are difficulties. Moses being very meek is an example; still, there is nothing in the Pentateuch which Moses could not

have written, and very little that is improbable. In affirmation, where facts are the indispensable basis, the theory is, beyond question, bankrupt. There is no shadow of a suggestion of a fact that the Pentateuch was written by P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, and other tribes. So far as the first axiom of science is concerned, the new theory can not comply. "The foundation of all science is facts." "The hypothesis should be based on facts, not on ideas, which the hypothesis involves." "There can be no science without facts." These primary and fundamental principles are disregarded by the view which finds not a line of the Pentateuch written by Moses. It is not the lack of scholarly ability on the part of the men who advocate the new hypothesis; it is the fault of the history, as we have seen.

Again facts may exist which would be true if **Credulity of Unbelief.** the hypothesis were true; the fallacious reasoning in such case appears to be, "these facts agree with the hypothesis therefore it is sustained". Not unless the facts are directly the basis of the affirmation. A stick thrust in the water appears bent. Two theories will account for that: (a) the stick is bent by the action of the water, (b) the rays of light are refracted. The former is the mode of reasoning adopted by some of the critics. The irregularities of the times of the Judges and Samuel are explained by (a) the law did not exist, (b) the law was violated by the people. Evidently either theory would explain. Which is true is a question of fact. Science cannot breathe without facts. When we appeal to the repository of facts, the archives of the Jews, they say repeatedly that the people transgressed the law, but never that the law was not given. Would not the latter have been the natural record if the law was not in existence? We read in the New Testament that the Holy Spirit was not yet given. Would not some patriotic Jew have made the memorandum in defense of his ancestors that the law was not yet complete? Could there have been a gradual evolution of the law for a thousand years and all that growth escape the pen of every historian and prophet and a totally different history be written? Is not this impossible to be believed?

It is not in the power of this theory to comply with the first axiom of science.

AXIOM II.—“After the facts have been gathered and verified, they are to be placed in classes. No fact can be omitted. A single absolute conflict between a hypothesis and a fact neutralizes the former. The fact is not damaged. The truth of tentative hypotheses must be tested by their application to facts. The discoverer must be ready carefully to try his hypotheses in this manner and to reject them if they will not bear the test, in spite of indolence and vanity.”†

“A true classification includes in each class those objects which have more characteristics in common with one another than any of them have in common with any subjects excluded from the class.”‡

This hypothesis fails at the outset. Dr. Driver says (Int. p. 127): “The revelation of God under three distinct names, Elohim, El Shaddai, and Jehovah”.

Science, in classification, can not omit one, nor can it cut one in two. The theory does both. We have in addition to these divine names, Adonai, El, and El Elyon. The analysis omits four.

It is held by science that all facts have significance, else they would not exist. **Facts Omitted.** El Shaddai, (God Almighty,) is a tremendous fact. It occurs nine times. El is the root of Eloah and Elohim. It is found forty-one times in the Pentateuch, applied to God. Adonai appears eighteen times. Though the hypothesis is rich in letters, no letter is given to any one of these names of the divine being. They are assigned to J, or E, or P, or D, or JE, as the case may happen to be.

Other facts are omitted in this classification. **Genesis 14 Torn In Pieces.** Gen. 14 is a huge fact not given a place. Abraham Lincoln was a captain in the Blackhawk war. To omit that fact would destroy the claim of any volume to be a scientific or literary history of his life. The 14th of Genesis is confirmed by the monuments in its historical credibility. It is a formidable *abattis* to the hypothesis. For it contains words which the critics assign to J, E, and P, and several which they cannot assign to any one. If they give it to one, the others are mortally wounded. The majority have rested

†Whewell Aphorisms, p. 38.

‡H. Spencer, Classification of the Sciences, p. 3.

in the hope that it was an interpolation. Archaeology disturbs that dream. Wellhausen declared Abraham to be a free creation of unconscious art',² (whatever that may be). He, with Kuenen, made Gen. 14 post-exilic; Dillman gives it to E, Knobel to J. Both explain away the words which belong to P and to the other letters.

Noldeke made it fictitious. Driver ignominiously falls down before it in despair, and leaves it out of his classification. Other facts are likewise omitted. The critic is confused. Thus Numbers 32 starts off with "JE in the main". That is, whether it is J or E, the critic does not know, but he thinks that the main portion belongs to one or the other. P takes two verses, 18 and 19; 20 to 27 are "JE in the main"; 24 to 32 are given to P, thus overlapping.

Genesis 41:16-45 is also an orphan. Dillman made it E, rewritten by J and worked over by R. Dr. Driver omits it. Exodus 6:14-29, he says, was "added by a later hand". Others are "partly E", or partly some one else. These are portions of the material omitted by a defective classification. This does not shut out the theory from consideration. No theory is perfect. It is certain this is not.

A classification ought not to cut a thing in two.

Wild Classification. If a person should class animals as vertebrate and invertebrate, with wings and wingless, with stings and stingless, then would say, "Bees belong to three of these subdivisions, but there are plenty of bees to go around", he would have as a result a no more whimsical division than the analytical theory displays. Take Elohim. It is worthy of a class by itself. But it will be found under E, D, H, J, P, and R. So Jehovah is found under every one of these letters and their imitations, E2, etc. Adonai and El Shaddai are likewise scattered.

It is evident that any rule of logical classification would forbid the division of the people of Illinois into white, college graduates, bulls, bears, populists, and dwellers in Egypt. Precisely this error the theory commits. It begins with a proposal to classify the writers of the Pentateuch by their preference for certain divine names. A logical and exhaustive classification is possible on that basis. But the hypothesis leaves some divine names fatherless and introduces other bases of classification.

²History of Israel, p. 230.

Excess.

D is classified on the basis of the book; P by his occupation, and H by the subject. Any one of these bases could have been made exhaustive, but who can tell why there should be a priestly writer and not a military scribe? Why should the subject of "holiness" be the only one that is favored with the distinction of a letter?

As Gen. 14 is a surd to the theory, so this criss-cross classification on several bases is, to science, a surd, and absurd.

Defect.

Any system ought to have enough heads to cover all the things to be classified. But the theory can not do that. There is no agreement yet as to the number of writers. Whether there be seven or twenty-two depends on Driver or Wellhausen. If that be not enough, R is invented. R is thoroughly unscientific, for his only use is that of a scapegoat; *e. g.*, Gen. 36. President Harper says of it:† "This chapter, it must be confessed, furnishes a strong argument against the analysis, not only because of the lack of agreement among the critics, but also because it is impossible to make out two accounts; but the case is not half so bad, if only the work of R is admitted."

R is lawless. He is like a boy. You can not tell what he will do next. Suppose a certain section assigned to J. In it there are words which belong to P. The logical conclusion would be that J used those words. That would break up the theory. Hence, various Rs. They are far from being scientific; they are subject to no law.

Clouds have been classified, but the elements of this new hypothesis never have been subdued.

"A single absolute conflict with a fact is fatal to a theory." Every time R is invoked, it is because of a collision between the theory and the text. There are more than two hundred collisions now known, and the rural districts yet to report. That is, by the time the end of Exodus is reached, R has been called in two hundred and fourteen times. To use a military metaphor, R is the ambulance corps. The theory is injured by contusion

†Hebraica, vol. 5. p. 274.

with ugly facts. R is signalled and lifts the maimed one to his feet.

"If only the influence of R be admitted", no theory, however wild, need despair, but classification is impossible.

AXIOM III. "No new hypothesis is called for **Theory Uncalled For**, unless there are facts which are unaccounted for by the existing hypothesis". This is distasteful to the new and ambitious theory. For the traditional hypothesis, without exertion, accounts for all the facts. Owing to the distance of time, and to brevity of writing, there are difficulties, but the new theory creates ten where it attempts to remove one by a wooden interpretation.

Science thus pronounces the new system an intruder. The theory of the biblical writers accounts for all the facts. That of the new criticism is dumb in the presence of many.

AXIOM IV. "No hypothesis is scientific which **Deduction Impossible**, does not allow sure and swift deduction." If it does, then it is a solid basis for prophecy. If it does not, it can not be verified and is useless. The times the new theory disappoints on this line, can not be told for number. Every appeal to R is an example. E is the Elohist. Then in a chapter containing Elohim thirty-five times, and no other divine name, we conclude that it is E. But no, that chapter is P. In a section where Elohim is found three times and Jehovah once, we would expect E. But that is J (Gen. 6:1-5).

Where E heads a chapter, we deduce the sure **Whimsical Division**, conclusion that Elohim will predominate. But Gen. 15 is given to E, and Elohim is not found in it once. If Jehovah is found in a chapter seven times, and Elohim not at all, does not that chapter naturally fall to J? No, it is E. (Gen. 15.) P is the priestly writer. Where the patriarchs built altars, offered sacrifice, and worshipped God, P ought to have been the recorder. He is shut out every time. In a chapter having no altar, no sacrifice, no worship of any kind, no priest, no temple, no religious usage, would not a priestly writer be the greatest misfit? P is put down for Genesis 1st, with Elohim thirty-five times. E has nothing till Genesis 15, then is

given a chapter without an Elohim in it. Where Jehovah Elohim occurs sixteen times, and Elohim alone three times, JE ought to have the first claim, E the second. But J takes it. It must now be clear that the rigid accuracy of science being absent, this theory can not be verified by deduction.

AXIOM V. "Finally all must be summed up into **System Impossible.** a system." These subjective fancies can be put together in a book, but they can never form a system. The theory is always in the periphrastic future perfect tense. It is the Keeley motor in theology. It will do wondrous things in the future. At this stage, one hundred and fifty years after Astruc, it would be difficult to point to a step it has made toward solid fact, in Pentateuchal criticism, beyond Astruc's conjecture. It is doubtful whether a critic can show one truth peculiar to the theory which it has given to the world.

The total absence of facts as a basis for the main propositions, begets skepticism of valuable results. It is not the want of ability, nor of learning, nor of research, nor of charming diction. It is the deplorable lack of that which no imagination, however brilliant, can create—i. e., congealed facts.

Elimination. We have found the new hypothesis emancipated from the restrictions of every axiom of science. Now we come to apply the two tests formulated by J. S. Mill before we further show why the theory is unscientific, and that it admits the fact. The method of agreement declares, "Whatever can be eliminated is not connected with the phenomena by a law". The priestly writer can be eliminated. In Genesis 1 there is no priest, no sacrifice, no incense, no worship, no approach to God, no altar, nothing religious. A priestly writer is an anomaly. For nearly a century this was given to E or E2. ax 1111
+ method
See 174

Then the account of sacrifice, of building altars, of worshipping God by the patriarchs, in Genesis, is not given to P. If he can be driven from the altar in Genesis and another allowed to write of these things, then he can be eliminated from every altar, from all worship. P is not connected with the phenomena by a law. He is merely tacked on like a temperance resolution to a political platform.

J is unnecessary. As having the monopoly of **P, J, E Cast Out.** "Jehovah", or as always using "Jehovah", he is conspicuous as a total failure. E, D, P, H and the troop of R's use "Jehovah", without noticing J's ownership in the slightest degree. Even worse indignity is heaped on J. Where he is found to the exclusion of Elohim, the chapter is given to E. J himself uses any divine name that is appropriate, so he can easily be eliminated.

In like manner every supposed writer can be shown to be a useless superfluity. The times, the people, of which they are supposed to have written never heard of them. If honored with the same respect that is shown to other literature, the books themselves repudiate every one of these fancied writers.

By the Method of Difference, "Whatever cannot be eliminated is connected with the phenomena by a law". From Genesis on, it is impossible to eliminate Moses. Take away what he did and said, with the necessary context, and almost nothing is left of the last four books of the Pentateuch.) See 17

Dr. Kuenen said that Genesis is the indispensable introduction to the other four books. He is right. Then Moses can not be eliminated from the Pentateuch. He is connected with the phenomena by a law.

A New Test. But the theory is not amenable to the laws of science. Another test which is not written in any scientific work, which is not invariable, is this: A logical theory, whether it be truth or error, courts discussion. A theory which rests on tradition or on authority of great names, or on fancy, prefers to be oracularly dogmatic, and shuns the arena. Word painting is captivating. It is a gift to be coveted. But severe argument alone delves to the truth.

Further evidence that the theory does not conform to scientific rules is found in numerous contradictions. This is so strongly marked that a new critic will sometimes contradict himself. Lack of space forbids an extensive list. Dr. Driver has inherited the winnowed wheat of many years of keen study by gifted athletes. He is himself a talented scholar and decided in his statements.

Dr. Driver says: "Criticism in the hands of Christian scholars does not banish or destroy the inspiration of the Old Testa-

ment; it presupposes it." In the same preface he says that in many parts of the Old Testament we have traditions modified and colored and speeches assigned to persons who never delivered them.

**Did Inspiration
Weaken?**

Dr. Driver's deity, wishing to furnish a revelation which "points forward prophetically to Christ", gives the world what Dr. Driver calls "unhistorical", "idealized history", "can hardly be historical" accounts.

Herodotus, tested by the monuments, is found to be accurate where he gives the result of his own observation. Moses, inspired of God, is inaccurate, is full of unhistorical assertions, according to the hypothesis. Hence, inspiration crippled a writer.

A Christian scholar with a mathematical mind can not hold both these views. He must surrender inspiration and join the originators of the theory, or he must affirm the truthfulness of the records. The theory collides with the history scores upon scores of times. President Bartlett counted 170 in Dr. Kuenen's Hexateuch.

Contradictions.

Dr. Driver says: "In Genesis, as regards the limits of P, there is practically no difference of opinion among critics." This is not upheld by the facts. The birds Noah sent out first divide the critics. Six different opinions prevail. P is sometimes in, then again ruled out. Genesis 14th and 36th are two other chapters in which the writers disagree on the limits of P.

Dr. Driver can not agree even with himself. He declares that "the legislation of Deuteronomy conflicts with that of Exodus and Numbers in a manner that could not be credible, were the legislator in both the same. When the laws of Deuteronomy are compared with those of P, such a supposition becomes impossible". (p. 82).

This is precisely what the conservative wishes his opponent to say. The legislation clashes. Then some man later than Moses gave laws to Israel, and affirmed that they were spoken by Moses at the command of God. This is forgery. This is contrary to ethical principles. It is repugnant to any respectful acceptance of Deuteronomy as the word of God. It involves Jeremiah, Hilkiah and Huldah, the prophetess, in deception.

If the bible is made of legends and manufactured speeches - it is a fraud - history and prophecy

Dr. Driver escapes from this consequence by contradicting himself and the facts, saying: "The new element in Deuteronomy is thus not the laws, but their *parenthetic setting*. And even this is new, not in substance, but in form."

Still farther removed from scientific accuracy are the contradictions in the same volume, where Dr. Driver's argument is in direct conflict with Dr. Driver's analysis.

Writing of J (p. 120ff), he describes the peculiarities of his style. We turn to the analysis in the first part of the same "Introduction", and find that confusion abounds. The argument refers J to Numbers 11th chapter, but that is JE. He refers to Numbers 14, which the analysis divides between P and JE, giving none to J.

He cites J:

Deuteronomy 31:16-22. In his analysis it is D2.

Exodus 19:5f. In his analysis it is E.

Numbers 24:9. In his analysis it is JE.

Numbers 11:29. In his analysis it is JE.

Genesis 15:6. In his analysis it is E.

Exodus 19:9. In his analysis it is E.

Numbers 21:14b. In his analysis it is JE.

Joshua 10:12f. In his analysis it is JE.

Numbers 21:17f. In his analysis it is JE.

Numbers 27:30. In his analysis it is JE.

Thus an Oxford professor contradicts himself twelve times within the lids of one book. This is completely foreign to science. These are only a few morsels from J. The other letters would lengthen the list.

The reader will recall the axiomatic oracles of the masters of science, that the inductive method is the only road to truth. We now bring evidence that while the new theory may recognize the truth of the axiom, it looks upon that road as leading up an inaccessible precipice.

The historic accuracy of the early books of the Bible is the main capital of the traditional critic. Destroy that, and he goes into bankruptcy.

The sagacious writers of the newschool know **Assume What Can Not Be Proved.** it is unscientific to assume that to be true which leaves the Bible completely at their mercy. This the newschool does. Dr. Kuenen frankly avowed his standpoint to be not that of the church. He considered Israel as common as India or China.

Dr. Driver puts, in a footnote to his preface, two colossal assumptions. He calls them principles, but they are alleged facts.

If these statements were true, the conservative critic would reject the historical books of the Bible as unworthy of study. Would any one claim that Dr. Driver was unconscious of the tremendous dialectical value of these two assumptions—*i. e.*, legends and manufactured speeches?

Is it not rather evident that the demands of scientific reasoning are by far too onerous to be met by the resources of the theory? Therefore, the very question at issue is assumed in a footnote to the preface, and called "principles".

An undisguised avowal of the unscientific **Bankruptcy Admitted.** method chosen is made by Dr. Driver: "A word should also be said on the method followed. A strict inductive method would have required a given conclusion to be preceded by an enumeration of all the facts upon which it depends." 177

This is correct, and it would have been the shortest and surest road to the conviction of the reader. Dr. Driver thinks it would have taken too much space. It would require no more than that necessary for proof. No other method leads to truth. He continues: "The method pursued has thus often been to assume the conclusion to be established, and to point to particular salient facts which exemplify it or presuppose its truth" (Preface, p. 4). 177

This is a backward step in scholarship. Dr. Driver's work has been highly commended on both sides of the Atlantic. It has reached its seventh edition. It has been translated into German. Evidently it is the best the Anglo-American school can produce. Equally evident is it that a man with Dr. Driver's learning would have brought his treatise into harmony with the imperative laws of scientific investigation, if the hypothesis had not been intractable. Could he have followed the axioms of sci-

ence, his work would have been impregnable. To scientific scholarship it is worthless. It is unscholarly, inaccurate, contradictory and retrograde.

"Certainly we shall not assist research with any evolution factor, grounded upon logic rather than upon inductive demonstration. A retrograde chapter in the history of science would open if we should do so, and should accept as established, laws which rest so largely upon negative reasoning."[†]

By the method pursued by Dr. Driver, any wild theory can be sustained. Erichhorn's theory can submit ten facts to one offered by the development hypothesis. The history of investigation is filled with accounts of wrecks of theories following that plan. All the hypotheses since Astruc, which vainly endeavored to throw Moses into the mud and put the critic on a pedestal, were true, if that method establishes a hypothesis.

Facts May Be Too The corpuscular theory of light, owing to the powerful name of Newton, held sway for a century. Many salient facts were quoted which
Few to Prove "exemplified it or presupposed its truth." It
Theory. never led to new discoveries. It checked investigation until the polarization of light became its *crux*.

The Ptolemaic theory of the solar system can be proved by Dr. Driver's method. For Brother Jasper points to the salient fact that in the morning the sun is on the east side of the house, and in the afternoon is on the west side. The house has not moved; therefore, the dusky preacher decides, "The sun do move". The earth, then, needs a tortoise to rest on: the tortoise must have an elephant, and the elephant must stand on wind.

A Fact May Agree President Jordan is right in considering such
With method a retrograde movement toward barbarism. Christian Science proves itself by quoting
Several Theories. salient facts which exemplify it. Witchcraft slew innocent persons by the hundred thousand in Germany, France, England, and America. It followed the method by which the hypothesis proposes to establish itself. That is, it assumed the conclusion, then quoted salient facts

[†]President D. S. Jordan, Footnotes to Evolution, p. 98.

changed the text

which presupposed it. The vast majority of facts can be made to harmonize with a number of theories. Some facts are crucial. The hypothesis meets many stubborn ones which refuse to be reconciled. Hence, Kuenen's 170 collisions with the text. To meet that difficulty, the hypothesis invented R. He is more lawless than a comet or a meteor. No scientific theory can be framed including R. Whenever the theory is squarely antagonized by the facts, R is declared to have changed the text. He is sometimes as wise as Solomon, and elsewhere a bungling incapable. He would combine two accounts into one so skillfully that it required thirty centuries and the eyes of numerous skeptics to discover the seams.

He is at once the greatest enemy and the dearest friend of the hypothesis.

An enemy, he rewrote the Hexateuch so that it clashes perpetually with the hypothesis. A friend, he helps the new theory in hundreds of instances. He had to be worked over-time, and two more like him invented. When Dr. Briggs last saw Dr. Holzinger, he had the fourth one nearly completed. But science can not handle R.

No deduction is possible because no one can predict when one of the erratic R's will appear. This is submitted as further evidence that the theory does not propose to be subordinate to the yoke of science.

No Fellowship With Science. If these weighty facts have not carried conviction that the hypothesis does not admit the sovereignty of scientific rules, to which the traditional theory humbly bows, the argument could be continued till the last analysis of the radical school would show that no such persons as J, E, P, and D ever existed.

At the outset both theories admitted the binding force of scientific axioms. The theory of Mosaic authorship readily complies with every one. The new view can not thus be trammelled. It is independent of all. This allows larger scope for fancy. It gives a bolder wing to imagination. This does not touch the linguistic or philosophic argument, nor does it interfere with the man who accepts the theory on the dictum, "In the field of scholarship the question is settled".

Though not scientific, the hypothesis may be philosophic;

though not limited by solid facts, it may be liberty loving; though self contradictory, it may be beautiful in its linguistic dress; it may charm by the wealth of words with which it is adorned.

IN THE NURSERY.

A Fable. A beautiful hypothesis tried to pass by and ignore the multiplication table. She drew her velvet skirts close to her side, and looked aloft, but stumbled over seven times seven. Down she went. Jack-in-the-box had given her a *dossier* stating that it was 47. "It is 49", said M. T., not moving an iota out of her way, nor offering a hand, nor removing his hat. "I think you are very unpromising," said she. "I must be," retorted he. "If not, just measurement would be impossible, proportion would disappear, civilization would stagnate, humor be destroyed and confusion be uppermost". "What is up, any how, to a theory moving in space?" asked she. "You would be if you understood me," said M. T. calmly.

Adapted and commended to every aspiring theory.

Scientific investigation has the force of a mathematical demonstration. The boasting of the theory in regard to the "scientific method" was premature. With not one axiom does it comply. It is unscientific from the first assumption to the last conclusion. There is but one way the eye can see, that is by light; there is but one method by which the blood can be oxygenated, that is by air; there is no way to come to God but by the Living way; and there is only one road to truth, that is by the collection and classification of facts. While Prof. Driver frankly admits that he abandons that method for one that is entirely unscientific, others forsake it without his frankness.

The traditional theory having an abundance of facts easily classified and arranged into a harmonious system, is scientific. Hence the proposal to abandon facts for fancies, science for speculations, is, to the majority of Bible students, unworthy of serious attention. But perhaps they have not sufficiently considered the argument from language, or that from psychology.

CHAPTER IX.

THE ARGUMENT FROM LANGUAGE.

**Not Difficult to
Follow.**

The advocates of the new theory are usually profound linguists. To some of us whose thoughts come by hard labor, and generally not until the next week, it is despair to see in their writings what a splendid vehicle for conveying thought is our mother tongue.

These men see in the vocabulary and style of the Pentateuchal writings evidence of different hands. A failure in proof here would be ignominious, while success most securely clinches the theory to the twentieth century.

The English student need not hesitate to closely follow the argument. One need not be a baker to know good bread; nor does he need to understand Arabic in order to judge whether an Arab speaks good English or not. Nor is it essential that one should be a Hebraist in order to pass on an argument when the terms are translated. That which is erroneous in English can not be true in Hebrew. Dr. Kuenen says that the critic has no other data than those in the hands of every student. Rarely, says he, is the critic called upon to change the translation.

I.—THE METHOD OF PROOF.

The Sure Method. The logical method in demolishing an ancient and cherished tradition is:

1. Show the tradition to be in conflict with the circumstances and history of the time.
2. Show that it is a legend or myth, with various points of origin.
3. Bring up counter testimony, upholding the new proposition.

The story of William Tell, lifted almost to immortality by Schiller, has in the last forty years been resolved into legend. It was proved that no war took place at that time in that region. The names Tell, Gessler, and others were not in contemporary history. The growth of the story was traced through a chronicle written about 1470, more than a century after the alleged time, then through Uri, Tschudi, and Schiller. Finally the legend of shooting an apple off of the head of a son or friend was found in Denmark, Germany, and Persia.

The hatchet of Washington's boyhood can be **Facts Bar That Way.** traced no further back than Weems's life. Weems was garrulous and fastened the story on Washington. The new school can not proceed in that logical way. Cold, unyielding facts give way not one millimeter. The theory labors under the disadvantage of the inflexible antagonism of every witness. The historians of the Bible unite with the Pentateuch in giving it all to Moses. No contemporary history assists the new theory. In vain the steps of the archaeologist are followed. He seemingly takes delight in hurling stones at the bold hypothesis.

The very books written by J, E, P, D and R, **Success in Deception.** know nothing whatever of their existence.

This was to be expected. The intention being to ascribe their work to Moses, the unique success which attends their effort is best attested by the unbroken silence of the Scriptures in respect to their existence. The uniform testimony of every writer in the Bible to the Mosaic authorship is overwhelming evidence of the complete success of their scheme to make men believe that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Such self abnegation combined with such skillful deception by many acute writers, living centuries apart, is unparalleled.

Easy Way Since the historic method is a closed door, the the inductive would appear to be the only one left open. Dr. Driver praises the inductive method, and recognizes its imperative demands, but substitutes the easier plan of assuming the questions at issue, and then quoting facts which exemplify the theory. Any theory can do that.

The practical American mind wishes to know that P, D, Q,

etc., actually lived. To assume that they did, then to quote some facts which agree with that supposition, has been the brief voyage of the Documentary and Supplementary and other theories, whose wrecks lie along the shores of the ocean of truth. Clerk Maxwell suggested that there are demons hurling the molecules of gases in their ceaseless and rapid movements. It is an example of agnosticism driven to absurdity in the attempt, to bow God out of the universe. Yet Maxwell can point to facts which presuppose his theory. That method proves nothing, because it will prove any wild theory which has been advanced in Pentateuchal criticism, or in any other branch of knowledge.

Dr. Driver thinks that if portions of Genesis can be picked out and pieced together to form a tolerably continuous record, it is evident that

it was written by another hand than that of Moses. The argument is defective, for,

(a). Scarcely any voluminous writer could withstand dissection by such criticism.

(b). Moses may have used documents, not only for Genesis, but in the middle books, *i. e.*, others may have written under his direction, Moses editing the work.

(c). It avoids the issue. The Pentateuch, originally one book, affirms Mosaic authorship for substantially the entire volume. To show that other men may have written portions no more disproves the Mosaic authorship than Tertius, writing Romans, disproves Paul's authorship.

Every historian avails himself of historical documents. Can any man take Macauley or Bancroft or McMasters and, without access to the original documents, pick any one of them to pieces and show the source of each of their quotations? Could any man take Bancroft's United States, and, not having seen or heard of Bradford's History of Plymouth Colony, or Elliott's History of New England, or Morton's Memorial, or Ellis's Puritan Age in Massachusetts, point out Bancroft's use of each one? By no means. Yet this is the task the new critic confidently attempts.

Moses was a genius, a learned man, a lawgiver, the creator of a nation. During the forty years in the desert he had ample time to revise and perfect his history and laws, even though we omit the help of the Holy Spirit. Is it conceivable that he would compile documents in such a clumsy way that the critic of to

day can select the original sources? Is it at all probable that God would give a revelation through men so stupid as to put two discrepant accounts of the same event side by side? Yet, this is Dr. Driver's sole argument. He devotes less than two pages to stating imaginary discordances in the records of Genesis, then proceeds as if he had sustained his affirmation: "The same event is doubly recorded. The language and frequently the representation varies in different sections." This is the slender foundation for the vast assumption that the scriptural declarations of the Mosaic authorship of the law are all to be swept aside, and not a syllable be left to Moses. Dr. Driver supplements this with a brief and unsatisfactory list of words or phrases peculiar to D and P. They vanish on clearer examination, and P himself disappears under the microscope of Prof. Moore of Andover.

II.—TESTING THE METHOD.

Repetitions. We probe Dr. Driver's proof. Owing to its primary importance, we examine again the assertion that there is a double record of creation. A double record is not unknown to literature, or to the Bible. Exodus, for six verses, repeats the concluding part of Genesis. Acts begins with an amplification of the closing verse of Luke. Saul of Tarsus gives an account of his conversion to the mob in Jerusalem, (Acts 22), then to King Agrippa (Acts 26). In the latter he omitted his birth place, his rearing, his teacher, his being near Damascus, his being sent into the city, the visit of Ananias and his return to Jerusalem. He adds some details, and condenses several revelations from God into one, and dates them at the time he was stricken.

Two Sauls. If Dr. Driver's reasoning is sufficient to prove two authors of the first two chapters of Genesis, the same logic will make two Sauls. The divergencies are fully as great. One was converted on the way, the other near Damascus. In one he fell to the ground, in the other all fell to the earth. In one the question was, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" in the other the taunt is added, "It is hard for thee to kick against the goads" From a friend of the first (Acts 9), we learn that the men heard the voice. The other declares that he alone heard the voice which spoke from Heaven. Other divergencies appear.

An orator handles his facts according to the inspiration of the hour. He glances, or dwells or emphasizes according to the end in view.

The official report to Moses by the twelve spies might easily vary from their talk to the people. Lieut. Hobson made a report of the sinking of the Merrimac to his superior officers, then wrote an article for the Century, then described it in a lecture. Each account might omit or amplify facts.

In secular literature repetition often occurs. In the 3rd chapter of his history of England, so consummate a master of style as Macauley, does precisely what Moses does in exquisite literary form, in Genesis 2nd. Moses repeats the creation of man with added details. In the first chapter he states the fact, in the second, he declares the manner. He consecrates the marriage vow, and lays the foundation for home and the care of children. No ridicule can fairly be thrown on the account as it stands. It is logical, it is literary. It endows man with a soul. It is a distinct advance in history.

As has been said, the first chapter is that of creation, the second is as clearly that of generation.

Generation is not creation. It means offspring. In sublime poetic fancy, inspired historians write of man as the generation of the heaven and the earth. Ten times is "*toledoth*",—"generation",—used in Genesis. In every case it is followed by a history or list of posterity. This is decisive. There is not only no attempt to write another account of creation, no appearance of such an attempt, but the title declares it to be different. Dillman felt that this was conclusive, so he sent R to take "This is the generation of heaven and earth", from 2:4, and to place it before 1:1. We protest that this is twisting facts. It is violently making history. There is no fairness, no scholarship, in knocking texts around to fit the theory. No other book on earth is thus maltreated.

But here R returns, declaring that Gen. 1:1 is so majestic, so sublime, so perfect that he could not place 2:4a on top of it. Besides, he whispers to Dillman, "generations" mean "posterity". How could the heavens and the earth have posterity before they were created, or how could their own creation be their own posterity?

■ Fails Once.

Then it would give the first chapter two titles and the second none.

The suggestion that the second chapter is an account of creation is subject to ridicule without any misrepresentation. It is geocentric. It puts the earth before the heaven. It has an earth without any light, or rain or sun or moon or star; with no air, or grass, or ocean, or fish, or reptile. It forms man myriads of years before he could find a plant or animal, or food for his breakfast. Collated with the testimony of the rocks, it puts a hundred thousand years between Adam's birth and Eve's coming. No wonder he felt the need of a help meet.

What a bungling account of creation is that which omits three-fourths of it and introduces marriage, speech, home, positive law, the work of man, geography and mineralogy. This is called an inspired account of creation. The first one is also inspired.

The themes of the second section logically and **Gen. 2 an Advance.** naturally advance the history of redemption.

The manner of man's creation, the importation of the divine spirit, God's care, man's home, his duty, his obligation to obey God, the restriction testing him, his marriage, his first effort at speech, and the geography of his birthplace, fill up the chapter. It is the direct and essential link to the third chapter.

Thus it moves forward toward the temptation, the fall, the promise, the prophecy and the fact of Christ, and never stops till it rests in the new heaven and new earth.

The words used reveal to the scholar a change from the first chapter to the second. Grass (1:11) is *deshe*, the wild grass which grows of itself (Job 6:5). *Chutser* is the grass cultivated for hay. The words "plant", "grew", "field", do not occur in the first chapter. They indicate cultivation. "Beasts of the field" differs from "Beasts of the earth". It is possible that domestic animals are the ones which Adam named. Dr. Driver rests upon the statement that God formed out of the ground every beast of the field and brought them to Adam.

Here the grammarians rise up against him. Dr. Delitzsch, in the last edition of his commentary, says it means, "God had formed the beasts".†

†See Dr. Green, *Unity of Genesis*, p. 26.

Dr. Delitzsch is an adherent of the new hypothesis. So is Strack, who, in 1894, so translated the term. Dr. Dillman says Strack's translation is admissible, but he sides with Driver on account of the context. Rabbi Leeser of Philadelphia adds his testimony to that of Dr. Delitzsch. Time is not indigenous to the Hebrew verb. It has but two tenses, the perfect and the imperfect. These must be understood with a wider latitude than the same terms in any Aryan tongue. "Complete" and "incomplete" are nearer the Hebrew thought. Dr. Driver says in his "Hebrew Tenses", p. 6, "In dealing with passages in which some degree of uncertainty must rest, the conditions imposed by the context, interpreted in the light of parallel constructions, will usually reduce it within narrow limits."

A similar grammatical construction (Kal, future with *way* conversive) occurs in Isaiah 38:21. It is after Hezekiah's psalm of thanksgiving. The translation is "now Isaiah had said: take a cake of figs, &c." Surely he would not say this after Hezekiah had recovered. Dr. Delitzsch also refers to Jonah 2:4 and Zech. 2:4. Strack added Jud. 2:6 and 1 Kings 7:13.

Dr. Green translates "Having formed". He shows that the order of narration is not the order of time. Rebekah is represented as alighting from her camel, out of respect to Isaac, before she asked who he was. (Gen. 24:64, 65.) The people believed and they heard. (Ex. 14:30.) The spies abode three days until the pursuers were returned; and the pursuers sought them and found them not". This, if the narration be the order of events, causes the pursuers to return before they searched.

Jud. 16:31 says that his brethren came down and buried Samson "in the burying place of Manoah, his father, and he judged Israel twenty years".

This makes Samson to judge Israel for twenty years after he was buried. Dr. Driver must recognize the idiom.

Aside from the technicalities of grammar, the question may be disposed of by the truth that **God Now Forms Beasts and Man.** God forms the beast of the field out of the ground today. At this hour he creates man and beast from the dust. It would be difficult for Dr. Driver to improve on the language of Moses at that point.

Regulation draws nutrition from earth today - animal draws nutrition from vegetation today - animal from dust - dust - vegetation

Chaldean Noah

Dr. Driver next sees two hands in the account of the deluge. After the critics had divided the account with variations to suit each one, George Smith found the deluge tablets in which the two accounts are one. No one would say that the tablets were by two men, yet the essential features of the deluge are the same in both Genesis and the Babylonian account. Dr. Driver thinks that repetition demands two writers; but,

(a). The Babylonian has many repetitions.

We quote from Price, p. 92:

"At the dawn of the seventh day, the rain, the flood ceased,
The storm which
. had battled like an army ceased,
The waters of the abyss sank back,
The great storm, the deluge, came to an end."

If a Babylonian scribe could write 185 lines like that with repetitions, why could not Moses ?

(b). Repetitions deepen the impression. The account of the deluge could have been written in a dozen lines. The Bible gives it about sixty verses; the Babylonian record, 185 lines.

(c). After the critic has made his division according to his own fancy, the repetition still remains. In P, Gen. 7:18-21, there are six statements concerning the rise of the waters. We may suppose that the critics who have P, P2, P3, P4, and P5, are more logical than Dr. Driver, who does not use so many Ps. There are four statements of the decrease of the waters given to P, 8:1-5. If Dr. Driver does not assign these repetitions to different authors, it is impossible to see any valid reason for claiming that repetition in a Hebrew history "precludes the supposition that the two accounts can be by the same hand."

Why should "And the flood was forty days upon the earth; and the waters increased and bare up the ark; and it was lifted up above the earth," require two writers separated by centuries? Or, "The fountains also of the deep, and the windows of heaven were stopped, and rain from heaven was restrained". That might be written by one vigorous writer, if really inspired, without fatigue. Yet the hypothesis calls for two.

The division makes nonsense. Thus we read **Critical Nonsense.** J's account: "Then began men to call on the name of the Lord. And he called his name Noah. And it came to pass when men began to multiply, etc". "But Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord. And the Lord said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark." Who called him Noah? Why was an ark there? Who built it? The seventh chapter, with 24 verses, has twelve changes of writers. J tells us that the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights, and the Lord shut him in. It was high time, but it was an oversight not to shut the door the day the elephant went in, and the down pour began.

According to J, Noah never left the ark. He took off the covering; builded an altar; offered sacrifice; his sons went forth, but the old patriarch was left alone with the menagerie.

P is equally given to bathos. "And God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was very good. And God saw the earth, and behold it was corrupt". Not a word of explanation does he give of this great change.

P destroys all flesh, while J excepts Noah and those in the ark. P "knows nothing" of any sacrifice or thanksgiving by the patriarch for this great deliverance.

Kuenen was troubled at the difference in the **Critical Worry.** law of sending away a Hebrew slave (Ex. 21:1-6 and Deut. 15:12-182) the latter enjoining that he should not be sent away empty.

Then he instances the clean and unclean animals in Lev. 11 and Deut. 14. The latter names, instead of describes, those with which they had become familiar.

Num. 35 and Deut. 19 contain the law of the cities of refuge. Fuller details in Deuteronomy surprise Kuenen so greatly that he has to employ an exclamation point.

These are samples that show that Kuenen (as he accuses Wellhausen) can make a weak argument.

Some of the German critics have fallen over the number of the first born. Reuss thought there must have been eighty-one persons in a family. Moses's wife and two sons riding on one ass; the two tables of the law being as big as tombstones; Jacob's sons going into Egypt with only one sack apiece and feeding only

one ass on the journey, are all made stumbling blocks. These criticisms are as if it were written: "They drove the enemy at the point of the bayonet", and a critic should say: "Only one bayonet in an entire army."

**History Made to
Order.**

Prof. MacDill shows that the beheading of Charles I and of Louis XVI can be shown by a future critic, adopting the brilliant method of this school, to be one and the same event differently told. Both men were kings and were dethroned. Each had a trial by an irregular court. Both were condemned, both beheaded, both regretted by a portion of their subjects.

So with Lincoln and Garfield. Both were elected by the Republican party. Both were shot in public places. Both were mourned. The assassins of both were put to death. According to the sage reasoning of this new school, two assassinations of presidents of the United States within sixteen years would not be probable. Therefore, only one happened.

Created Troubles. Wellhausen has the law written on twelve large stones, then reasons that they could not go into the ark. Graf saw the tabernacle inside and outside the camp both at once. He had probably been drinking tea. Wellhausen has two decalogues, Ex. 20 and 34. Dr. Briggs is also worried over decalogues and pentades, but kindly buries them in the appendix. Dr. Driver considerably drops these difficulties into the waste basket.

In concluding this section of the review, we may say:

These Objections Unworkable. (a) All these objections were created by Hobbes, Spinoza, and Voltaire. Not one is original with the present hypothesis. Their parentage does not render them invalid. Their discord with facts does this. Unbelief is always dialectically languid. It is irrational. No hypothesis, unless driven by intellectual bankruptcy, should go to such a source for argument.

(b). These feeble objections are old. They were fully answered a century ago, in the reply of the Jews to Voltaire, and have been refuted a thousand times. It is strange that Christian scholars will handle them.

(c). They are useless. The man who would be convinced by such shallow logic would believe the theory without it. All he needs is the assurance of Dr. Briggs, "In the realm of scholarship the question is settled". Men who take the trouble to examine the proof texts and to think, will be checked from any cordial examination of further arguments. Such reasoning does the hypothesis more harm than good.

III—THE VARIANT USE OF THE DIVINE NAMES.

It may be doubted whether Astruc's "conjecture" has ever been of any value. It has led to a large amount of study, mainly on the theories which never received the suffrage of the cool, steady body of biblical scholars.

The difficulty seems to be two-fold; one is an absence of facts, the other is a lack of logical insight. Linguists may excel in their knowledge of language at the expense of other faculties. Logical power, if not dependent on, is measured by mathematical predilection. "All science at the bottom is quantitative, and whatever is true to us can be reduced to measurement."[†]

The hypothesis limps in making any positive assertion. Dr. Briggs[‡] asserts that there is general agreement that there are four narratives in the Pentateuch:

- (a). An Elohist writing, designated by P;
- (b). A Jahvistic writing, J;
- (c). A second Elohist writing, E;
- (d). The Deuteronomic writing, D.

But on opening Driver or Dillman—and Briggs names several analyses which agree—we find H, JE, D2 and other letters which have crept in surreptitiously to spy out the liberty of the hypothesis and to mar its beauty.

P Disobeys the Theory.

According to the hypothesis, P is to use Elohim up to Ex. 6:3. But P uses Jehovah in the interdicted territory. Notwithstanding the heroic efforts of the critics who rushed in and hewed two verses to pieces (Gen. 21:1-2), giving the first half to J, and the second to P, the ungrateful P calmly uses Jehovah right there (21:1b) and in 17:1.

[†]President Jordan; Footnotes to Evolution, p 9

[‡]Hex, pp. 68, 160.

In like manner E refuses to keep in the hypothetical harness. Jehovah provokingly appears in the E document, in Gen. 15 (seven times) and in 22:11-14, 28:21; Ex. 9:35, and twelve times in Ex. 10, beyond which we have not carried the investigation.

The J document is equally indifferent to the affirmations of the theory. He should eschew Elohim, which belongs to P and to E. Gen. 3:1-3-5, 4:25, 24:3bis., 26:24, 6:2-4, 7:9, 9:27, 27:28, 31:50, 32:9bis., 28:30, 33:5-10-11, 39:9, 43:23bis.-29, 44:16 and twenty-six examples without going beyond Genesis, are without counting the frequent use of Jehovah Elohim, in which J traverses the theory.

D is a cross classification. It can not be tested
D and H Cross Eyed along this line. H is no classification at all.
Classification. It is an arbitrary title given to the summary of laws in Lev. 17-26. Moses gives it a title (Lev. 26:46) as the statutes, judgments and laws which the Lord made between him and the children of Israel by the hand of Moses. August Klosterman, who was not at Sinai, so far as we can learn, but at Kiel in Prussia, gave it another name. He styled it "The Law of Holiness", and the critics adopted it while rejecting his theory of the Pentateuch. Lev. 10 to 16 has more to say of holiness than has H. (See Note B).

Ask the hypothesis why Elohim alone is written in Genesis 1, why used alone in Eve's conversation with Satan, why employed in the encounter with Abimelech, why Jehovah Elohim appears in Gen. 2 and 3, why Jehovah is in some portions and Elohim in other parts of the account of the deluge, why El Shaddai is the name in the making of covenants, and Adonai in prayer. The hypothesis can answer only that a man in Babylon, 450 B. C., wrote Gen 1, and he preferred Elohim up to Ex. 6:3, then sometimes used Jehovah; that E1 and E2 chose Elohim, J1 and J2 wrote Jehovah, while JE, D, H, P2, etc., used any name.

(a). It is a groundless assumption.

(b). It is directly in conflict with the facts.

(c). It is a wooden interpretation. The Hebrew saw an idea in every proper name. This represents J, E, D, P, H as unanimously stupid in their use of the names of God.

(d). Their own analysis overthrows this portion of the argument hundreds of times.

The truth is beautiful. In that early dawn all **Beauty of Names.** nature was fresh from the hand of the creator, fragrant with the breath of his presence. The lowly bush was aflame with his glory, and the patriarch walked with God. Every name of God was a revelation. Each name is chosen because that is precisely the one to be used in that connection. Those names are histories; rather, they are metaphors of history. The Mohammedan has ninety-nine names for God, but he sums them up, and all perfection, in the one hundredth—Allah. The Assyrians had 65,000 names for their gods. Jesus has 156 names, or titles, given in the Scriptures. Every one has a meaning. So does every name of God. Instead of being dull, meaningless signs, as the theory predicates, every one is musical. It thrills with deep significance and stirs the responsive heart.

Elohim does not belong to one God alone. It **Elohim God of Nature.** is given to heathen gods (Ex. 12:12). When the LXX came to Ps. 8:5, where man is said to be created a little lower than Elohim, they lowered the translation to "Angels". So we read it in Heb. 2:7, evidently a quotation from the LXX, in preference to the Hebrew, which is strong—Whether it ever means angels has been warmly discussed. The advantage lies with the negative.

Judges are called Elohim (Ps. 82:6). So are idols, as the calf of Aaron, (Ex. 32:1), Dagon (2d Kings 1:2, 3), and a goddess whom Solomon worshipped, (I Kings 11:5). Elohim is a plural form. The singular, El, means might, strength; (Gen. 31:29), "It is in the power of my hand to do you hurt". It is applied to Nebuchadnezzar, (Ezek. 31:11), "The mighty one of the nations". As a name of God "El" appears sixteen times in Genesis alone. "The most high God", "God Almighty", "Almighty God", are examples in which it is used with other words.

"Elohim" is plural, yet construed with a verb in the singular. Whether it be the plural of majesty, or of excellence, or of the triune nature, are questions yet undecided. It occurs about two thousand times in the Old Testament. It means a being of power, the god of creation, of nature and of judgment. It is a common word for all peoples. Satan, Jethro, Abimelech, Heth and Balaam use Elohim. If they use Jehovah, it is as the name of the special God of the Jew.

While "Elohim" is a generic name "Jehovah" is personal. This is given to no other than the covenant god of the Hebrews. Jehovah is properly used when the God of Israel is placed over against the gods of the gentiles. This is the correct term for God as the author of revelation and redemption. Where this revelation of himself is prominent, there Jehovah will be used. Three such instances have been noticed: the revelation of Adam and Eve (Gen. 2:4 to 4); the revelation to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Gen. 12 to 26), and the fuller revelation to the Jewish nation (Ex. 3 to the end of Deuteronomy). These are an orderly progress in God's revelation of himself and his purpose to man.

The language of Jacob after the vision of the golden ladder, "If God will be with me, . . . then Jehovah shall be my God", is strong support for the idea that Jehovah was regarded as the special god of the Jews, and that there was a struggle in the patriarchal mind against polytheism. Hence, there was the need of showing that Jehovah was supreme, that he was one with Elohim, and that there is no other God. Dr. Driver nearly stumbles upon the truth when he classes Elohim and Jehovah as the god of nature and the god of revelation, respectively, and says that J's representations of God are highly anthropomorphic. (Int., p. 120.)

"El Shaddai"—"God Almighty"—is appropriate in expressing the omnipotence of God. Therefore, it is the term used in covenants.

We are now prepared to answer the questions to which the reply of the theory is jejune. "Elohim" alone is appropriate for Genesis 1, because it is creation. The next section gives "Jehovah Elohim", with three exceptions. A two-fold reason exists. It is Jehovah because he reveals himself to man, not merely in nature, but in his providential care. He is as a father to man, and talks to him. But it is essential that Jehovah shall be shown to be the creator. Hence the term "Lord God", *i. e.* "Jehovah Elohim".

The three exceptions occur in the conversation of Eve with the serpent. "Elohim" is used by Satan. Eve responds with the same appellation, which is appropriate in talking to an alien.

Singular Plural form Singular
 El - Elohim Jehovah
 God Lords Lord

The identification of Jehovah with Elohim being so strongly made in this section, the phrase rarely occurs afterward. Once more in the Pentateuch we meet it (Ex. 9:30), where Moses wisely employs it with Pharaoh, to show him that the Jehovah of Israel and the Supreme Ruler of Egypt are one.

The different object and the changed name also explain the difference in style between the first chapter and the next section. Elohim as the god of creation moves in a precise and formal order, as he commands the forces of nature to march forth at his bidding. In an anthem a verse or two is sufficient for the different voices—soprano, alto, tenor and bass—to repeat again and again. So in this epic of creation. "And God said . . . it was done . . . and God saw it was good".

God Speaks to Be Understood. But when the All-Father comes to build a home for his son and daughter; when he tells the regulations of the new life; when he must chasten for their sins, yet give them radiant promise of a Coming One, it is meet that the representations should be in deed and in speech, such that children can understand. Even in the first chapter anthropomorphisms are found. Elohim speaks. He calls the light *yom* in the Hebrew tongue. He sets the sun and moon in the heaven. He blesses the animals, reptiles, and birds, and even says, "Let us make man in our image". There is no such sudden or radical change as to imply another writer. If Dr. Driver holds a mechanical theory of inspiration which makes Moses a type-writer, then every change of style and diction requires a new man. A scriptural theory of inspiration is under no such pressure.

Majesty of First Two Chapters of Genesis. Between these two sections there is no difference except that which the natural advance in the history and the revelation of Jehovah demands. These chapters are perfectly natural, life like, picturesque, pathetic and sublime. As an antidote to polytheism, pantheism, atheism or agnosticism they have reached far larger results than all volumes of philosophy, apart from their majestic revelation. As an account of the entrance of sorrow into human life; as a revelation of the problem of evil, as a basis for man's hope and a solace for his woe, they are as far superior

to the reasonings of books as the dome of the heavens is above the reach of man's arm. As the base in the lofty oratorio of redemption, this record heightens the joy of sins forgiven, and bestows songs in the night.

To all this beauty and majesty the hypothesis is color blind. With the stolidity of the phlegmatic Dutchman who can see in Israel's history no god, no miracle, no prophecy, the new theory can discern nothing in the use of the divine names but individual peculiarities sadly interfered with by R. The reader who wishes to follow the exquisite adaptation of the divine names should read "The Unity of the Book of Genesis" (Scribner's) by Dr. Green. In the linguistic argument he is unanswerable. We delay to notice that as Jehovah is identified with Elohim in creation, so in the flood; it is Elohim in judgment, and in nature, but it is Jehovah remembering Noah and caring for his own.

The choice between the clumsy, inconsistent, **A Gate of Beauty.** and superficial assertion that different men employed separate names, and the accurate and exquisite explanation that the meaning decides the selection, is neither dubious nor difficult. It is surprising that scholars who are poetic, receptive of the most delicate impressions, weavers of grand thoughts in most powerful and graceful language should endorse this stupid and stony explanation, while the hard headed conservative, who puts forth statistics and figures, cold, dry, irksome though they be to the radical, holds firmly to this revelation so marvelous. It is an open door to the glories beyond. Every page of divine writ takes on new meaning when one reads Jehovah, Elohim, El Elyon, El Shaddai, Adonai, Eloah, not as meaningless handles, but as revelations. That this is the intention is clearly shown by the language of God to Moses, Ex. 6:3; "I appeared by the name God Almighty, but by my own name, Jehovah, I was not known." Here the radical faces a blank stone wall. To the conservative the wall is down, the horizon swept away, and a landscape of wondrous beauty stretches far away beyond the stars of God.

We have dwelt at such length on this diverse use of the divine names in the opening chapters of Genesis, because it is the strongest argument adduced by the theory in proof of the imagined two documents. A thorough test was due to the worthy advocates of that view.

The cook does not need to bake half a barrel in order to determine whether the flour be good or not. Nor does the thoughtful reader need to wade through all the dreary and fruitless speculations of the critics in order to decide that the exigencies of the theory often control conclusions, and invariably postulate assumptions. For ourselves, when we defend the new hypothesis, we shall avoid these arguments. They do but weaken the cause.

IV.—THE VOCABULARY.

A Mathematical Demonstration. We are now to enter the maze. Next to the variant use of the divine names, the peculiar phraseology used by the supposed writers is relied upon as proof. This can be reduced to figures. It thus approximates a demonstration.

In the Hexateuch there are 6449 verses. P has the largest share—2698 $\frac{3}{4}$, or forty-one per cent, of which a number are halves and thirds. If P, with forty-one per cent of the whole can not establish a peculiar style, it would be useless for other letters to try. Pres. Harper has shown that up to Genesis 12:5 the Hebrew has 485 different words. Of these, P uses 239 and J 367. They use in common 121, or one-fourth of the total. The total number of words used in this section he states to be 3727, of which P has 1858. This is forty-nine per cent which is a little higher than the analysis of the Hexateuch now gives to P. These figures of Pres. Harper furnish a basis for computation of the number of words peculiar to P in the entire Hexateuch.

Supposing the proportion of words to be the same throughout the Hexateuch as in the first twelve chapters, the deduction is easy.

1. For there are 485 different Hebrew words up to Gen. 12:5. In all the Hexateuch there are 2661 different Hebrew words. Out of the 485 Pres. Harper finds 118 words used by P alone, but he makes only 56 to be peculiar to P. This is almost arbitrary. The critic says that a certain word belongs to P because he always, or nearly always, uses it. P does that because the critic gives that word to him by his own volition. Another critic gives that word to J or E. The same happy intuition makes each critic quite positive in his opinion. A compromise was effected, and in such cases the influence of R is admitted. There is no higher evidence that these 56 words were peculiar to P than the

opinion of the sage. With that as a basal assumption, and following Pres. Harper, we deduct one-fourth of the words used in the Hexateuch as the proportion which would be used in common.

The 485 different Hebrew words used in the first eleven chapters contain 121 used in common by P and J. Deducting that number, leaves 364 used by the two, of which P uses 118; J employs the remaining 264. If P kept up that proportion through the Hexateuch, he would use 615 similar words. For, taking one-fourth from 2661, we have 1996. As 118 is to 364, so 615 is to 1996.

2. However, President Harper counts only fifty-six of these peculiar to P. This modifies the calculation, and reduces the number to 291.

3. There are 163 verses and seven half verses given to P in the twelve chapters noted. In the Hexateuch there are 2698 verses assigned to P. Then the proportion will stand as follows: 167:2698::56:904. This computation gives 904 words as a possibility for P.

4. President Harper finds 49 per cent., the analysis by Driver 41 per cent. belonging to P. Taking the latter as the smaller number, it yields, after deducting one-fourth of the total number of different words used, 818 words for P.

The calculation with J gives him from 550 words up. But E, H, D, and R, with all their seconds, have to be reckoned in the estimate. In Driver's analysis the percentage of these can be estimated. For these last-named letters there ought to be 1050 characteristic words.

The new school has been alert in prospecting this lead. Prof. Stahelin spent twelve years in separating J and E. Prof. E. König arranged their peculiar words in two tables, with one hundred words in each. But E. W. Hengstenberg sifted these lists with such discouraging effect that Dr. Driver doubts if J and E can be separated. In 320 verses he makes no attempt to separate them. Dr. Briggs endorses Dr. Driver as their best linguistic authority. Certainly the Oxford professor of Hebrew inherits the winnowed labors of a century and a half. This learned author presents the linguistic argument as strongly as the best scholarship will permit.

P has fifty words peculiar to his style:

J has none;

E has none;

D has none, but has forty-one characteristic phrases;

H has none, but has twenty special phrases.

Thus out of a possible 1954 words peculiar to the supposed writers of the Hexateuch, the theory comes up with only fifty. The failure is crushing and humiliating. That scholars so gifted in language might be defective in historic insight, and unacquainted with the rigid and uncompromising axioms of science, can be generously conceded, but only when the demand for linguistic accuracy is emphasized. The peculiar phrases amount to nothing. There are sixty-one culled from 3750 verses. That is not deep scholarship.

The characteristic phrases of Deuteronomy are inflated. Every reader of the Bible recognizes the difference between Deuteronomy and every other book in the Bible. It is therefore unnecessary to tabulate phrases not found elsewhere. With all that conceded, Dr. Driver's list is slovenly. The first ten are used in the middle books. They are not characteristic of Deuteronomy at all. So the list is cut down, (see note B) till there are very few left.

H is a summary of laws. That legal phraseology is peculiar no one doubts. So twenty phrases in Lev. 17 to 26 form no evidence that a stranger had to step in and show Moses how to write the law.†

Testing P.

The traditionalist is hilarious. He is undevout. For, when the list of fifty precious words belonging to P is submitted to him, he overthrows the faith of some by irreverently saying: "The resurrection is past already; here is Falstaff and his band; they will all trek if inspected, and Dr. Driver will say that P is not historical anyhow". The inspection of the fifty words given to P carries us into the Hebrew. Only seven words will be here tested, that every reader may understand the method. First, the rules necessary for guidance:

1. A scissors exegesis is not American. Our public schools have taught us to be more accurate. To slice a verse or two out of a section, or to cut a verse into halves or thirds, may comport with German ideas of scholarship, but we are proud to say that

†For the seamy side of these lists see note B.

it will never be patented in America. By that surgical exegesis, a word that would be used by J or E is transferred to P. To treat the Bible with such indignity and such bungling scholarship will never become an American custom. No other book could be thus abused without subjecting the exegete to ridicule.

2. Technical terms used only in the middle books are demanded by the subject.

3. A word used by other writers, or used only two or three times in the Hexateuch, can hardly be called peculiar to a writer.

4. A word used more than three times, without mutilation of the text, by one writer only, is incontestable. A fair-sized number would go far to prove a style and a special writer.

The Inquest. Dr. Driver's list of Hebrew words, upon which he relies to prove that P exists, because he alone uses these words, is as follows:

1. "God", not Jehovah, "up to Ex. 6:3". This transgresses two rules:

(1). E, J, D, H and JE all use Elohim as well as Jehovah, so this usage is not not peculiar to P.

(2). A verse is cut in two in Gen. 2:4 to prevent P from using Jehovah. Yet P uses Jehovah, (Gen. 17:1, and 21:1) which contradicts the affirmation.

2. Kind (*min*). It is used by D (Deut. 14:12, 13, 14).

3. To swarm (*sharats*), used by J (Ex. 8:3). One verse is cut out of a J section (Ex. 1:7) for P.

4. Swarming things (*sherets*), used by D, 14:19.

5. To be fruitful and multiply (Ex. 1:7) is one verse cut out for P with these words. It is used by H (Lev. 26:9).

6. For food (*loklah*), used by H (Lev. 25:6).

7. Generations (*toledoth*). A verse is divided to give this word to P (Gen. 2:4). In Gen. 25 there are eight changes of writers, but *toledoth* is given every time to P.

Gen. 37:2 suffers a bad amputation. Seven words out of a verse of forty-five are cut off for P. Then Dr. Driver speaks of P's fondness for lists and enumerations. But they are given to him *volens volens*. After all, Ex. 6:16 and 19 are two occurrences of *toledoth* which are not P. "Added by a later hand", says Dr. Driver.

For the remainder of the fifty words the reader is referred to the appendix.†

We report the result of the inquest. P is dead. For his obituary and pious remarks by chief mourners, see chapter XV.

The linguistic argument has two sides to it.

Archaic Words In the Pentateuch. The radical could challenge the conservative: "If the Pentateuch was written by Moses, if

he used documents dating as far back as Abraham, then there would be Aramaic terms and Egyptian words. Moreover there ought to be in the Hexateuch a large number of words which would become obsolete by the time of the captivity".

That is fair. We submit a list of 400 Hebrew words found in the Hexateuch and not later.‡ If it be said that many of these words are technical and were demanded by the topic, that can be conceded. The number can be lessened by one-half, and yet they are far in excess of any list the hypothesis has submitted. But that concession subverts their linguistic argument. The same claim can be made for every word in the Pentateuch. There is no defense for the plan of cutting a verse in two in order to save a word for an imaginary writer.

Fifteen per cent of the words used in the Hexateuch find in those books their grave. This is perfectly in accord with history and the laws of language. In language, the new school ought to hold the citadel. They excel in that line, they have given many years to that study. It offers the best field for ingenuity. But even there the traditionalist, with equal scholarship, more scientifically used, presents problems which the new critic has not found time to answer. Here are over 400 words, used in the Hexateuch and not used by writers, who, according to the hypothesis, were contemporaneous. There are 3078 words used by writers outside of the Hexateuch, while the Hexateuchal writers employ none of them. The themes of religion, of law, of wars, of journeys, of social and civil life occupy the attention of all of these scribes, yet there is the contrast. Like the word "Jericho", changed in spelling after crossing of the Jordan, like the variant use of divine names, like the quotations from P by D,

†See Note D.

‡See Note G.

two hundred years before P was born, the theory can be relied on to furnish more amusement by awkward explanations than it will solid argument.

Those who take the theory second-hand are requested to believe that from about 850 B. C. several unknown scribes wrote the Hexateuch, ascribing it to Moses, and employing 400 words, which were dropped completely from Hebrew literature and other words substituted by men who wrote by their side.

For an oriental tongue to change so rapidly is unparalleled. The Semitic tongues resist innovation with remarkable tenacity.

The Wellhausen school can ride serenely over these facts by coolly saying that the writers of the Hexateuch sought out archaic forms, in order to deceive their readers into the belief that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. We rejoice to say that the Anglo-American school shrinks from that solution—and also from any other.

Rephrased by this

The Egypt of which Isaiah and Jeremiah wrote was very different from the Egypt of the eighteenth dynasty, with which Moses had to do. All the allusions are true to what the monuments and papyri reveal of the Egypt of that date. Forty-five words are quoted in the Speaker's Commentary. A word may be a fossil. As a trilobite reveals to the geologist the narrow limits in which it is found, and is never placed by him this side of the Paleozoic age, so words become mute, but irreproachable, witnesses. In some important points the Speaker's Commentary is sustained by the independent testimony of a noted French archæologist, M. Harkavy, as well as by Egyptologists generally. In fact, no contradiction can be found.

If Canon Cook were wrong, it had been courteous and scholarly in Canon Driver to have pointed out the errors. In not one instance does he do so. He calls Canon Cook's statements "very exaggerated and inaccurate". Canon Cook takes the trouble to copy from the monuments the Egyptian hieroglyphics, so as to carry direct conviction. Dr. Driver meets this with unsupported assertion. This in a question of archæology, where he is not an expert.

We confess to considerable pride in this list of over four hundred words limited to the Hexateuch. It is a monument not to be overthrown. These words are fossils. To the acute philologist, who holds no brief, they are as conclusive as marine shells

in Kansas are to a geologist. As a positive argument they are invincible. How can any sound scholar believe that P, with forty-one per cent of the Hexateuch, was written in Babylon: that Deuteronomy and Joshua were written only two hundred years earlier, and the rest only two hundred years before Deuteronomy; and then that other writers during this period avoided four hundred words used by these popular and classic writers of the Hexateuch?

The credulity of the incredulous enables these **Credulity of Unbelief.** profound linguists to believe that the Hexateuch writers, in a vocabulary of 2661 words, employed 409 which their contemporaries did not, and avoided every one of 3078 Hebrew words used in the remainder of the Old Testament. Then, grammatical peculiarities and obsolescent forms mark the Hexateuch from the other books. Surely these scholars believe enough. Critical studies do not destroy the faith faculty. It seems that they enable it to stand without support.

Among the men most competent to pass judgment on different styles of Hebrew, Pusey, **The Best Hebraists** are With Moses. Lightfoot, Ellicott, Osgood and Green (most of whom have fallen asleep) found in the purity of the Hebrew of the Pentateuch an insuperable barrier to the new theory. Prof. Green, chairman of the American committee for the revision of the Old Testament, who issued a fifth edition of his Hebrew grammar 37 years after he published his first, wrote: "The language of the Pentateuch is, throughout, the Hebrew of the purest period, with no trace of later words, or forms, or constructions, or of the Chaldaisms of the exile."†

The new school shrinks from grappling with this argument. Wellhausen said at first, that the Hexateuchal writers, in order to mislead, studiously inserted archaic words. That would do while he thought there were only a dozen, but when Keil laid down two hundred as a sample, that argument lost all force.

Dr. Driver is equally desperate. He says "Inaccurate and misleading", and applies other similar epithets, but in no instance does he select any one and show that it is inaccurate.

†Schaff, Herzog, Rel. Enc. Vol. III, p 1799.

With still greater recklessness he says we have no other proof that the documents are ancient, than these words. Consequently the argument is circular. To one who regularly goes around in a tub, proving the existence of a writer by his style, and creating his style by arbitrary surgical exegesis, the allusion to an argument being circular is hazardous. That the writers of the Pentateuch lived from 850 to 450 is the dictum of the majority of the new critics. The demand for an explanation of 409 words found in the Hexateuch, along with grammatical forms and words used but rarely afterwards, and the omission of 3078 words used by other writers of the same or nearly the same dates, is not circular.

Then we have other testimony. The history is irrevocable. It has not been successfully impugned. When Dr. Driver says there is no other testimony than those words, he deliberately denies the truthfulness of the sacred records. To do so without evidence of their mendacity, is violent and unscholarly.

V.—JUDGING FROM STYLE AND CONTENT.

In some degree this is possible. "The style is the man". With a writing known to belong to an author, a critic may judge whether another writing is by the same author or not. Certain words come readily to one, while another would use synonymous expressions. While there is ground for such judgment, many acute critics have erred along this line. Charles Dickens was certain that "George Eliot" was a man. No woman, he said, could write such philosophical novels.

Jndges Err. "Six of One by Half a Dozen of the Other" is the title of a modern story told by six authors whose names were given, but not attached to the chapters. The guesses of the critics were as often wrong as right. One chapter, written by Frederick B. Perkins, was confidently assigned to Mrs. Stowe. A noted literary journal said it was impossible for her to veil her hand.

Sir Walter Besant finished a novel left by a departed friend. He testified publicly that the critics failed to detect the line between the two authors.

The "Monroe doctrine" was not originated by James Monroe. He embodied it in his message to Congress, but it was originally written by John Quincy Adams, while secretary of state, to our

representative at St. James. Internal evidence alone could not have revealed this.

Junius; Forty-two of Him. The Letters of Junius aroused intense interest in Great Britain. They were published at intervals between 1769 and 1772. The resources of the government were employed to ferret out the writer. Forty-two persons were named. Hundreds of books and pamphlets were published on the subject. Macauley said that all reasoning from circumstantial evidence was at an end if Sir Philip Frances was not the author. It is now conceded that Macauley was wrong, though for forty years his was the accepted opinion.

Facts Created. W. E. H. Lecky is not prejudiced in favor of revealed religion. His predilections lean the other way. He says (quoted by Bartlett, p. 303): "The reader is no doubt aware with what rare skill this method of inquiry has been pursued in the present century, chiefly by great German and Dutch scholars, in dealing with the early Jewish writers. At the same time, without disputing the value of their work, or the importance of many of the results at which they have arrived, I may be pardoned for expressing my belief that this kind of investigation is often pursued with an exaggerated confidence. Plausible conjecture is too frequently mistaken for positive proof. Undue significance is attached to what may be mere casual coincidences, and a minuteness of accuracy is professed in discriminating between the different elements in a narrative, which can not be attained by mere internal evidence. In all writings, but especially in an age when criticism was unknown, there will be repetitions, contradictions, inconsistencies, and diversities of style which do not necessarily indicate different authorship or dates."

This ripe scholar does not stand alone in looking upon a criticism so largely subjective, with the disrespect of a true and fearless student. A mind like Lecky's could not defend a theory not strictly scientific and historical.

see
206

The Acts of the Apostles has been treated in that way. Baur made the line between the Petrine and the Pauline elements strong, and saw the hand of a reconciler in the Acts. Dr. Clemen analyzed it into sections. He saw a history of the Hellenistic Jews, a life of Peter and a life of Paul all worked up into a book by a Judaizing Christian, who added much of his own views of what history ought to have been. Then a writer not in sympathy with the Judaizing tendency added portions with his opinions sustained by the accounts. Then came a neutral hand which inserted chapter 6:1-6, and some minor touches, leaving the Acts in its present form. The best living authority on Acts is Prof. Ramsay. He pronounces this scheme "simply impossible". "When a theory become so complicated as Clemen's, the humble scholar who has been trained only in the philological and historical method finds himself unable to keep pace, and toils in vain behind this daring flight. We shall not at present stop to argue from examples in ancient and modern literature that a dissection of this elaborate kind can not be carried out". (St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen, p. 13.)

The French school made three discrepant documents in Jeremiah, by as many writers.

**Proving What Is
Not So.**

F. C. Bauer once proved to a group of friends that an article in a review was written by a well-known officer of the government. All accepted the reasoning as decisive, except one. That was Baur's brother-in-law, the Bavarian statesman, Von Mohl. He said: "Now, Baur, you pretend to prove to the world who wrote the different parts of the New Testament, and you do not know what your own brother-in-law wrote. I wrote that article myself".

With Beaumont and Fletcher's plays, which rank next to Shakespeare's, the critics were never successful in partition.

Men try to tell what paintings were by Tatian, which by his pupils, which by his imitators, which by copyists who never saw him. Tatian is not here to say who is right when judgments clash.

Sir Walter Scott did not reveal himself at first when he wrote the Waverly novels. The literary world was in great doubt until he solved the question.

The earlier critics, stalwart men, Gesenius, Deuteronomy Early Wette, Ewald, Bleek, and others, affirmed that or Late, Deuteronomy was written long after the pre-Per Wish of Writer. ceding books. The new school makes Deuteronomy the mine out of which the middle books were extracted.

Graf made the narrative early, the laws late. Then, urged by Rheim and Kuenen, he made the narratives as late as the laws. Style did not hinder its being dated hundreds of years either way.

By treating history as Wellhausen, Kittel, and Driver handle the historical books of the Bible, it can be shown that Washington and the American Revolution are not historic, but are an analogy. The reality is the struggle of the soul against sin, and its deliverance. Washington is the deliverer, Benedict Arnold is Judas, England, like ancient Egypt, is the devil.

VI.—SIGNS AND WONDERS BY THE NEW HYPOTHESIS.

The new method of treating the Bible is not Sauce for the Male yet patented, therefore the conservative can Bird. use it. He carries it further than the radical.

The latter stopped when he found that J, E, P, D, etc. wrote the Hexateuch. The conservative boldly applies it to the New Testament and to modern literature. S. C. Bartlett wrote for his own amusement, a critical division of Galatians. This is admitted by radical critics, even the Tübingen school, as one of Paul's undoubted epistles. Pres. Bartlett, taking the methods of the divisive critics, with abundant notes and references, showed that Galatians, while largely the work of Paul, manifested the hand of Luke, touches by John, indications of the writer of Hebrews, and of a final redactor. He had it ready for the press when he learned that a profound German scholar had done the same thing in earnest.†

Forgeries have been committed on Scott and on Shakespeare which have deceived critics.

In 1843 Pastor J. W. Meinhold led all German Bewitching the critics astray by "The Amber Witch". It Critics. claimed to be an ancient work found in the island of Rugen in the Baltic. Written in the old High German of two hundred years before, it had to be de-

†Veracity of the Hexateuch, p. 301.

eiphered. It purported to be the work of an eye witness. It revealed ancient customs, describing the trial of a witch. The German critics wrote ponderous review articles on its treasures. "Scholarship" pronounced it of the age of Adolphus. For more than a year the author enjoyed the disquisitions on the precious document. When he exposed the hoax, some of the critics who had seen such indubitable proofs of its age could hardly be brought to believe it. A few confidential friends confirmed his statements.

Archbishop Whately wrote "Historic Doubts Concerning Napoleon Buonaparte". He resolved him into a collection of legends, by the methods which the new critics apply to the Scriptures.

Rev. Samuel A. Peters wrote the famous blue laws of Connecticut. Many persons believe them to be genuine.

Shakespeare's plays were modified by his associates. Many attempts have been made to distinguish the difference in the authorship. Of Coleridge's work in that line, Macauley said his pretensions were pure nonsense.

Prof. Philip Schaff wrote a work on "Ante Nicene Christianity". By critical methods it was shown to be a compilation from distinct and mutually inconsistent sources. Strong reasons were given for doubting Dr. Schaff's connection with it altogether.

Dr. Green analyzed the parable of the Good Samaritan and that of the Prodigal Son. The heart of the new critic ought to have been filled with joy at the sight of such wonders worked by the hypothesis. On the contrary, his angry passions rose. He called it impertinence and ignorance.† According to the B document we learn: "And Jesus said unto him . . . that fell among robbers . . . Go thou and do likewise." This would never have been brought out if Dr. Green had not had the help of the hypothesis.

Milton's three short poems—L'Allegro, Il Penseroso, and Lycidas—in a total of 1754 words, have only sixty-one that are common. It would be easy with the methods of "modern scholarship" to prove three writers. In Tennyson's Lotus Eaters Prof. Stanley Leathes found the same evidence of a different writer from that of

Oenone. Both together have 1310 words, but only 230 in common.

Lowell furnishes an example in his Bigelow Papers. The versatility of his diplomatic addresses is not equalled in the Pentateuch, because it is not needed there.

S. Weir Mitchell, M. D., of Philadelphia, wrote for the British Medical Journal, 1877, an article on "The Influence of Mescal". He wrote for a philosophical review, "The Double Personality of Mary Reynolds". For the Century he wrote "Hugh Wynne", a novel of the Revolutionary war. If a living American writer possesses such diversity of talent why could not Moses have written the Pentateuch?

The major premise of the argument is, "Any document of sufficient length and variety of topics to be divided into sections which show different phraseology must have been written by different authors. The Pentateuch is susceptible of such division. Therefore the Pentateuch must have been written by different authors."

The same is true of the Declaration of Independence, generally believed to have been the work of Jefferson. Its component parts can be traced back to the Meckelberg Declaration, to the address of the Sons of Liberty, and to the Crisis.

Washington's cabinet was a debating club. Jefferson was a commoner. He and three other men in the world's history object to the title, "Mr." Those three are Jesus of Nazareth, George Fox, and Herbert Spencer. They base their objection on the ground that Mr. means Master, and no man should be called Master.

Alexander Hamilton was a born aristocrat. **Who Wrote the Farewell Address.** He favored, even then, making the United States a Nation. The Farewell Address of

Washington contains so much of Hamilton that some have claimed him as its writer. It has also strong features of Jefferson's platform. A recent essay makes Madison its author. It is probably the product of Washington's rare common sense. Yet a critic could, from the writings of the three statesmen, cull out words also found in the Farewell Address, and thus make it composite.

Dr. Luke writes the purest Greek of the New Testament. He quotes those who use Hebraisms. The hypothesis furnishes

the method and example by which Luke can be clearly traced to various sources. The speeches by Gabriel, by Mary and by Zacharias can be followed to the prophets, from there to the Psalms, and then to the primary elements in the law. This, in a few weeks' study, will yield as large an income of amusement, and equally as much value, as the new critics have reached toying with skeptical tools, in a century.

Indeed, the reader, without the use of Hebrew, can make a more scientific and comprehensive division of the Pentateuch than the hypothesis presents. Facts are to be no obstacle. Law need not control. Decide upon a definite system. Divide the Pentateuch or Hexateuch into four documents. Call one L, meaning land; another O, for offerings; still another O, for others—*i. e.*, duties toward other men. Finish with F, for fighting, since there was war in those days. Then assign each verse to one or another of these letters. Chop up a verse, if necessary. Drop your authors anywhere along the stream of time. Your theory can easily be more systematic and consistent than any we have yet seen. The deterrent consideration is that after you have the Hexateuch all assigned, and LOO2F beautifully laid out, some wag, without reverence for scholarship, will insist that it is your name spelled backward.

Here is a book which claims to be a Higher
Briggs' Hexateuch a Criticism of the Hexateuch by Briggs. The
Composite Work. evidence that it is a composite work is strong.

One writer is I. He is pompous. He lays down a large program in the preface which receives no attention from the subsequent writers. He jumps up on pages 47 and 62, both times to tell of his studies. S comes next, so called from his Stately Style. He writes in the plural number, which differentiates him from I. The redactor hurries him off the stage. After laying down four lines of inquiry, and six lines of evidence, he and his four by six disappear. B is the first real writer. He does fine work historically. He is so engrossed in his theme that on page 36 he presents stale, malodorous objections with such enthusiasm as to lead us to think he believes them. He thinks there were three codes (p. 106) which he names D, H and P. He discourses of them in happy ignorance of there being any others. Page 122 presents the ascent from the covenant code to the priests' code with no room for other writers.

G1 is polemic. He knows four codes or writers. This he affirms on pages 47, 48, 100, 103, 104. He gives their characteristics just as B did for three. G1 does good service for the side he opposes. On page 103 he names them E, J, D and P. On page 154 he calls them P, H, E and J. His cool assumption of the point most deficient in evidence, his ready substitution of unlovely opinions for refutation, and his sublime conviction that scholarship is with him are cheering. The calm stoicism with which he passes by demonstration that his method is vicious, all convince the thinking reader that G1 is talking.

G2 is the *enfant terrible* of the book. He is like G1, only more so. B is conservative enough to admit Mosaic legislation and Mosaic codes, pp. 128, 156-7. But G2, not having the fear of B or of Moses before his eyes, says, on page 125: "It is not surprising that the school of Reuss put the covenant code in the reign of Jehoshaphat. It would be difficult to find it, in all respects, in previous history".

G2 holds that there are five or more codes or writers in the Pentateuch.

On page 68 he classifies. On page 107 he enumerates, making five every time. On pages 153-4 he quotes the doctrine of the five in regard to sin. The redactor was a weak man who yielded to the last presented. In the index he names six codes. G2 is liberal in providing writers for the Pentateuch so as to relieve Moses of any trouble. He names P1, P2, D1, D2, J1, J2, E1, E2. On the previous page he endorses Holzinger, who needs four redactors. This makes thirteen. "Thus the problem of Pentateuchal criticism becomes complex and extremely intricate" (p. 138).

R, who put together these discrepant fragments and made the word "Briggs" out of the initials of the various writers, is parenthetic and lovely. At least he is as blind as love. As the ardent lover can see beauties hidden to other mortals, so R can see in the Pentateuch a resemblance to the four Gospels after it has been criss-crossed and hashed up by the lucky thirteen scribes of page 138. They take it from Moses and the desert and scatter it from Samuel to Ezra, and countersign the history with "colored", "manufactured", "ideal picture", and see in it beauty and truth.

He looks for the anti-critics to die and the critics to live on. As Ireneus saw a reason for the four gospels in the four winds of

heaven and the four corners of the earth, so R finally decides that there are four codes. Then he looks forward to the day when the American lamb shall lie down with the German lion in peace and in pieces, inside. Remarkable eyesight. Backward to what never existed, forward to the impossible, and seeing both.

He has assigned the book to Dr. Briggs in order to gain the advantage of his well-known name. But critical methods enabled us to lay bare the documents underlying it.

The new critics never supposed that their methods would do more than discover what is true. It will go further, it will discover what is not true. Then it will convince the critic, unless he is false to his method, that the not true is true. Said we not truly that these are signs and wonders?

Scrutinize the following example closely. We shall make it mathematically exact.

1 Thessalonians and 2 Timothy are of nearly
Paul Divided. the same length—one with eighty-nine verses,
the other eighty-six. In the Greek 621 different words are used in both. Of these 131 are used by both writers. The writer of 1 Thessalonians uses 213 peculiar words. The author of 2 Timothy employs 277. 1 Thessalonians has "Lord Jesus Christ" nine times, 2 Timothy but twice. 1 Thessalonians uses "Christ Jesus" twice, while 2 Timothy has it eight times. "Jesus Christ" alone does not appear in 1 Thessalonians, but is found four times in 2 Timothy—

Dr. Driver utters the caution that a division on the sole basis of a variant use of the names of God is not safe, but when these differences are accompanied with peculiar phraseology, style, and conception, the division is sanctioned. These additional items are very marked in these two letters. 1 Thessalonians is by a premillenarian, 2 Timothy is by a post millenarian. The former has the archangel descending with a trump, the saints caught up in the clouds, etc. 2 Timothy bids the young preacher to teach faithful men who shall be able to teach others, that is to the third generation, at least; a strong contrast with, "We shall be caught up in the clouds". The first is enthusiastic, optimistic, full of joy. The second is earnest, rather disheartened, despairing of some men and full of warning.

The difference in vocabulary is great. While both have to do with the Gospel, while both use the expression "The Lord" or "Our Lord" about fifteen times, their style and thought vary greatly. We are happy to find President Harper sustaining our view of two writers for these two epistles. That is, it is conclusive to him in the first eleven chapters of Genesis, that when 485 words are used, and only 121 are used by both writers, there must have been a P and a J. We enjoy this advantage over Dr. Harper, that the division was made for us. We did not pick out certain verses and split a sentence in two in order to separate Thessalonians and Timothy. No one protests that we have cruelly sundered what God joined together, and have turned a sober account into two disconnected and fragmentary pieces.

We have 621 different words in the Greek, and only 131 common to both Thessalonians and Timothy. The proportion in Hebrew for P and J is 25 per cent, while in the Greek it is 19. That is, in every hundred words, P and J would use 25 in common, and each would use 75 which the other did not employ. In the new Testament instance they are further apart. Thessalonians and Timothy use in every hundred words 19 in common, and 81 separately. As eighty-one exceeds seventy-five, so our proof that 1 Thessalonians and 2 Timothy are by two hands exceeds Pres. Harper's evidence that two writers are to be found in Gen. 1 to 12:5.

**Romans by Four
Pauls.**

"Romans Dissected", by Prof. McRealsham, is the best work in this line. It is by Prof. C. M. Mead of Hartford Theological Seminary. We are dependent on reviews, not having seen the

book.

The "Amber Witch" is not the sole instance of a critical imposture undertaken for amusement. If the reader will practice on Romans for an hour, he can make out four writers and a redactor. The primary distinction will be the use of the divine names. The prologue—1:1-8—is written by JC. He prefers "Jesus Christ". He gives away to G1, who adheres to "God" as his choice. JC is a theologian. We can concede that the difference between JC and CJ might not in itself decide the question of two writers, but when we find JC an Arminian and CJ an Augustinian ("Shall the thing formed say to him who formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?") we are driven to the conclusion

that as sure as there were different writers for the Pentateuch, so there were for Romans. JC ascribes man's salvation to his faith. He lays the possibility on human shoulders. At 2:16 JC is evidently the work of R. From 1:8 to 3:20 we have G1. He is legalistic. He applies the law even to the Gentiles. He reasons from nature, and consequently is pessimistic. This G1 was probably a disciple of John the Baptist. The rigid abhorrence of wrong which characterized John and brought his head to the block is strongly reflected in G1. G2 is fully in sympathy with G1, but has heard the Christ preached. He first appears in chapter 7. JC wrote 3:29 to 7, which has been inserted here by the redactor. The sense is continuous, if one passes from 3:19 to 7. In chapter 8 we meet the gentle mystic, CJ. This term occurs but twice before. In Acts 19:4 it is used to introduce John's disciples to a more mystic realization of the work of the Redeemer. In 3:24 we pronounce it the work of meddlesome R. CJ holds the field from 8:1 to the 10th, when G2 reasons up to 14. Then JC finishes, though there could be critics who would see a new hand—one who preferred the simple title, "Christ"—hence to be called C.

From a review in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1892, we quote concerning this work:

"There are 928 different words in the epistle. Of these
 173 are used by G1 alone.
 173 are used by G2 alone.
 98 are used by JC alone.
 186 are used by CJ alone.

There remain 300 which are used by two or more writers. Of these only forty are used by all four writers. Ninety are used by three. One hundred and seventy are used by two.

G1 uses 341 words.
 G2 uses 382 words.
 JC uses 275 words.
 CJ uses 400 words.

More than half the special words (173 out of 341) are used by G1 alone. The proportion of peculiar words is as follows:

G1 50.73 per cent.
 G2 44.76 per cent.
 JC 35.64 per cent.
 CJ 44 per cent.

The proportion of words to the number of verses is not the same.

G1 uses 4.67 times more words than he writes verses.

G2 uses 2.92 times more words than he writes verses.

JC uses 3.24 times more words than he writes verses.

CJ uses 2.82 times more words than he writes verses.

Compare this with President Harper on Gen. 1:1 to 12:5, in *Hebraica*, October, 1888.

Whole number of different words 485.

Of these P uses 239.

Of these J uses 369.

Words peculiar to P 118

Words peculiar to J 246

364

From whole number 485 deduct 364 we have 121 used in common. Turning to Romans we find that G1 and G2, who might be expected to be harmonious, together use 613 different words but only 110 in common. But they use more words—613 plus 110 make 723. This against 485 of J and P. J and P have 25 per cent. in common while G1 and G2 have only 18 per cent. in common. This is a mathematical demonstration that there is stronger proof of the non-identity of G1 and G2 than that of J and P.

Comparing with the other writers of Romans:

G1 with CJ we have 628 different words and 113 common—18 per cent. common.

G1 with JC we have 531 different words and 85 common—16 per cent. common.

G2 with JC we have 639 different words and 118 common—22 per cent. common.

The percentage is never more than 22, it is as low as 16. The average is 19. That is to say in using one hundred words two writers of Romans will use nineteen in common, while J and R would use twenty-five words in common. The evidence is thus 6 per cent. stronger for different writers for Romans, than for the existence of J and P.

There is no fallacy in the above application. It is honestly done. It is mathematically exact. The reader of the Greek will note the different meaning given to *adikia* (unrighteousness), *dikaio* (righteousness), *dikaio* (justify, pardon), *sarx* (flesh), *nomos* (law) by the respective writers of Romans. Such differ-

ences are pressed in the case of J and P, and may be in the epistle of Paul as well. Paul can be subjected to vivisection as readily as Moses. The new critic can not meet this argument. When brought to the notice of Dr. Briggs, his temperature rises, but he makes no effort to show that the principles of that school have been wrongly used. It proves as decisively as a mathematical problem that the critical method is handled in an unscholarly manner by the progressive school. With the precision of figures it reveals four writers for the epistle to the Romans. This being an absurd conclusion, why is it not absurd to predicate a P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, and other ghosts, as the supposed composers of the Hexateuch? Dr. Driver says that Deuteronomy does not even claim to be written by Moses. Nor does Romans by Paul, then. It is stronger in Romans, for while Deuteronomy expressly declares that "Moses wrote this law", in Romans we read, "I, Tertius, who wrote this epistle".

The assignment of a word to P or to J by Pres.

Critical Methods. Harper is from a purely subjective testimony.

He feels it. Not so in the assignment of 1 Thessalonians and 2 Timothy. They are already separated. They read in either case as though a man of intelligence had written each one. Other criteria are present, style, vocabulary, content, theology, and spirit, are all different. The differences are so much more strongly marked than the differences between E and J in the Hexateuch that in 320 verses, Dr. Driver despairs of separation, while in the New Testament instance there is not a word which is not definitely assigned.

Further, the analysis of the Pentateuch is under constant revision, this is not the case with our examples. Dr. Mead's work on Romans has been before the critical world for eighteen years. Not a change has been made. We do not propose to change an iota of our analysis whatever the criticism be upon it. Always we shall maintain that such and such words are used in 1 Thessalonians and 2 Timothy but never shall we waver and alter as the new school perpetually does.

Dr. Mead's work has never been met. We doubt if any critic ever attempted it. Certainly it has not appeared in any notable work or we would have eagerly sought it. Yet it is conclusive. Truth cannot be ridiculed. Men always caricature the truth

they wish to overthrow and can not meet fairly. We submit that in the application of the peculiar methods of the new theory, of methods which would be scouted as ridiculous in other fields of literature, the critics have been unscholarly as well as unscientific. Further in their use by such accurate and competent scholars as Dr. Green and Dr. Mead there is no false step. No caricature is resorted to, no warping of the method. But here is the mathematical demonstration, that as much beyond nineteen as twenty-five so much stronger is the evidence for four men writing Romans over that for two men writing Gen. 1:1 to 12:5.

President Jordan of Leland Stanford Jr. University says that science must express itself with mathematical accuracy. In the list of references to Deuteronomy and to the entire Pentateuch by later writers, in the list of 409 Hebrew words, in the application of the whimsical and unscientific methods of the militant theory to portions of the New Testament, there has been no failure on the part of those who believe that what the Bible says of its own origin is worthy of credence.

On the other hand where we have a right to expect accuracy from the acknowledged ability of the profound linguists who advocate the theory, we are disappointed. No list of words for the numerous writers claimed, except for P. His quailed before the examination. True to the character given him by the theory, as a mendacious forger, he was found to have other letters' property in possession, and then he coolly proved an alibi by vanishing from sight altogether.

The characteristic phrases of D proved what no one ever denied, viz., that D was written in a peculiar style. So H could be expected to vary as a summary of laws.

The only effort to meet these overwhelming demonstrations is indirect, if indeed it be an attempt. Prof. Moore of Andover brings forward Tatian's Diatessaron. It is the oldest harmony. It supplanted the gospels in the churches of Syria and held place till the fifth century. Prof. Moore claims that if the gospels had been lost and only this had come down we would have a case parallel with the Pentateuch. The answer is:

1. It is not the contention of the conservative that a book

could not possibly have been written as Tatian wrote. Moses may have used documents for the Pentateuch clear through, with the exception of the closing portions of Deuteronomy. Herbert Spencer has employed twenty men, educated men, to whom he has assigned the examination of classes of literature so that he could make vast generalizations. Yet his voluminous works are his, the discrepancies are his. The style, the philosophy belong to Spencer. Moses may have had an army of copyists, he may have written nothing with his own pen till the close; indeed, as Paul to the Romans he may have dictated all. The narratives of the early ages were in all probability written before his day. But Moses was the Spencer of the Pentateuch.

2. We know by other testimony that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John actually lived and wrote. We count Prof. Moore our best ally in proving that J, E, P, D, H, etc., never even lived, and, therefore, could not have lied.

3. We have the separate writings from which Tatian quoted. If we had not, we could not separate them as now. Prof. Moore candidly concedes that, so far as the synoptics are concerned. We might pick out John's gospel, but could not separate the others.

4. Tatian did not lie. He never pretended that someone else wrote his book. The critics assign numerous falsehoods to the men who forged the Hexateuch.

5. We have external testimony of that age, which confirms the gospel story. The prophets and early historians are diametrically opposed to J, E, P, or R having any hand in the composition of the books assigned them.

6. The harmony of Tatian needed no R. It is simple and sensible, and an honest work. R makes Pentateuchal criticism lawless. It puts scientific investigation out of doors. A little of R, an occasional addition by a copyist would harmonize with what we know of ancient writings, but when it amounts to hundreds of interferences, there is no possibility of deduction.

CHAPTER X.

THE ARGUMENT FROM ETHICS AND RELIGION.

President Harper has said: "The Bible is the **The Bible Supreme.** embodiment of God. In a true sense, it is God. In so far as it becomes a part of us, God enters into us. In so far as we come into spiritual relations with it, we come into spiritual communion with God. This and nothing else is comprehending God."†

Prof. H. L. Willett, also of the University of Chicago, has neatly defined the purpose of the new criticism: "Thus the Bible may be restored to the true place which it is fitted to occupy in the knowledge and affections of all the people of God, from whose interest it has been too frequently removed by the theories that made it incapable of apprehension."‡

These two gifted scholars, with untiring zeal and encyclopedic knowledge, have probably done more to induce the habit of Bible study than any other two men in America.

Pres. Harper has fostered the study of the Bible in English and in the original tongues, while Prof. Willett has caused its pages to flash with gems whose presence was never suspected by those who had passed over the same mines for years. Forcibly and persistently he has emphasized the truth that the greatest foe that the Bible has to encounter is neglect. From that neglect, caused by the lack of interest, it has been his happy fortune to rescue it in the minds of multitudes, to whom it has become a new and more precious volume.

†Harper: Why Should I Study the Bible? p. 18.

‡Christian Evangelist, 1900, p. 394.

**Theories Die, the
Book Lives On.**

The new critics do not lay claim to infallibility. They hold a theory which is the direct descendant of the documentary, the supplementary, the fragmentary and the crystallization theories, all of which have been ardently espoused, then abandoned. If this theory is not competent to deepen reverence for the word of God, and to advance the truth in men's hearts, it, too, must become a memory.

The conservative must remember that the Ptolemaic theory held its way long after Copernicus died. In 1806, in Paris, eighty theories were presented, in the then young science of geology, which have all been outgrown. The world of thought is full of such histories. But every rejected theory converges the rays of light nearer to the focus of truth. Each theory tested and cast aside, lessens the number possible. DeWette, possibly with a sneer, welcomed the development hypothesis in 1835, saying that it was necessary in order to complete the circle of possible opinions.

When every theory concerning the origin of the Pentateuch, save one, shall have been pronounced untenable, that one will stand conspicuous on the ruins.

In applying an ethical test to the theory of a late origin of the early books of the Bible, it will be convenient to separate Deuteronomy. The author is so completely unknown that the letter "D", from the word "Deuteronomy", is taken to represent him. His century is lost.

Stahelin and Kleinert put him in early in the time of the Judges. Vernes drops him this side of the Return. What led him to write the book, why he should have concealed his name, puzzles us, as well as the critics. No higher spiritual ideal is found in the Old Testament.

Antecedently we should expect that a book with laws impressed by such fearful curses and rare blessings would be anchored to time, place, and author. A song, a philosophy, a proverb may be anonymous, and even timeless. A prophet may rely on the truth he declares, but a law is under imperative demands to emanate from a competent authority and to bear that seal.

I.—WAS IT A FORGERY?

The question includes the Pentateuch, but we may segregate Deuteronomy. This is the parting of the ways. The vast majority of biblical scholars can not admit that the book is a forgery

and inspired; a deception and of God; a production of "D", and true. It will be difficult for some of them to believe that any man can believe both sides of these antinomies.

We have searched the English language for an adjective between "forged" and "genuine," to be applied to Deuteronomy. The blunt Anglo-Saxon tongue, so far as we know it, can not compass it. It is either the one thing or the other. So it was to Bishop Colenso. He said it was a forgery by Jeremiah. W. Robertson Smith said it was a legal fiction, which shows that Smith was not a lawyer. Thomas Davidson called it an innocent deception, which links it to the Jesuit, who can lie for the glory of God. The German critics generally hold that D wished to deceive. Prof. Cheyne makes God a party to the deception, saying that he prompted the Mosaic party to act.

That, if believed, would lessen respect for our
A Forgery. Maker. Dr. Briggs asks: "Were not Josiah,

Hilkiah and Jeremiah capable of giving authority to such a law book, as a code of divine law essentially Mosaic in origin?" Is not all authority from God, and is not that authority that of truth and love alone? Could God make the assertion true in Deuteronomy if that book were composed about 621 B. C.? The critics hold that the law of a central sanctuary was new. It collided with the law as expressed by E, and with the practice of the nation since the day of the patriarchs. If that be true then Deuteronomy made every sacrifice outside of Jerusalem to be sin, and dated the regulation back to Moses. But if Moses did not say that, as the theory must teach, then Josiah, Hilkiah and Jeremiah gave authority to a falsehood. Surely our God hath eyes too pure to look upon iniquity. The burning lightnings of His wrath never were fiercer than when directed against deception and falsehood. How, then, is Canon Driver able to say: "Its inspired authority"? Could the Holy Spirit inspire a man to write such untruths?

The supposed writer of Deuteronomy condemns himself. "The prophet which shall presume to speak a word in my name which I have not commanded him to speak, even that prophet shall die," (18:20). If that came from God, it came from Moses, as the book affirms. If D wrote that he indited his own death sentence. He must have known, with the Hebrew fear of God,

that it was near the blasphemy. If it were a righteous act for him to write in the spirit of Moses, why not for others? He prevents later attempts in that line, or, more correctly, he tried to be the last law giver; P came in with forty-one per cent. of the Hexateuch.

The admission that Deuteronomy is not genuine, the perplexity of calling it inspired and yet unhistorical, the prohibition of the very action D is carrying on, (when the penalty was death), the numerous falsehoods, the evident intention to deceive, the daring of assuming to make new laws for Israel, which is more turpid than the sin of Miriam for which she became a leper, all point to the conclusion, if, indeed, they do not coerce it, that the theory is stunted and inadequate in its ethical ideal.

The extreme critic claims that it was a forgery, but he does not conceal his purpose to destroy faith in a divine revelation. The moderate wing is subject to no such criticism. It is abhorrent to them. They fail to consider the effect of such a confused and defective theory. It involves the revelation of the moral character of our God. Accepting the words of that bold thinker Pres. Harper of the University of Chicago, "The Bible is the embodiment of God", the non-ethical character of Deuteronomy sadly injures our conception of God. Is it not a high price to pay for belief in the theory?

II.—CAN THE SCRIPTURES BE BROKEN ?

The Master assumed that the Scriptures cannot be broken. Every declaration made stands inviolable. The advance of knowledge has compelled interpretations to be recast. That is the ready explanation given by the evangelical wing of the advocates of the militant hypothesis. Is that sufficient? The history is antipodal to the theory so that the Pentateuch, Joshua and the Chronicles are ruled out as witnesses. Are not these Scriptures broken? Can one believe the theory without attaching a Pickwickian sense to the Scriptures?

Dr. Driver says that there are elements in P which are not historical. That is too mild. P states a hundred times, at least, that God spoke to Moses and to Aaron and tells what he commanded. According to the theory this was using some freedom in putting speeches in the mouth of God. Is not that a fearful wrong? Is it not lying in the name of the Almighty?

The Mosaic law has won high praise from the **The Law Wonderful**. ablest jurists. It has the sublimest beginning, the grandest and most awe-inspiring background, and the longest sweep of any system of laws among men. It throbs in the polity of every civilized state; it combines a rigid demand for obedience, with provisions of mercy in just proportion, never achieved by another law. The Scriptures declare that this peerless system came from the lips of Jehovah. His finger wrote the Ten Commandments. His voice uttered the statutes and judgments.

The theory breaks the Hexateuch into 295 fragments, written by men so completely lost to history that their existence can not be proved, while their names are hopelessly buried in oblivion. A writer in northern Palestine, designated as E, wrote the Decalogue in the century 850 to 750 B. C. He wrote a number of the statutes and enactments, which the Jews supposed they received from God through Moses. Why that stiff-necked nation accepted forged laws, a yoke which they never bore with resignation, or why the true prophets should endorse the law-givers in their deception, are mysteries not explained by the adherents of this view. If the nation were deceived, and the prophets misled, still the Holy Spirit could not be a party to the deceit. Yet the inspiration of the Old Testament is freely conceded. The uniform and unbroken testimony of Scriptures agrees with the claim made by these unknown writers that Moses was the author of the law. The record makes no provision for amendments, the theory can not select the portions which form a nucleus by Moses to which successive reformers added new laws. Like the gospel, it was "once for all" given to the people; being divine, it needed no readaptation or improvement by human wisdom. The assertion that not God, but E, wrote the Decalogue; not Moses, but D, gave the book of Deuteronomy to the nation, causes the Scriptures to be broken.

A plea for mercy is hereby filed for the sacred text. Its narrative is turned into ridicule and untruthfulness; its connected story is minced into sections; its verses cut into bits to fit the theory. No American was ever in danger of making a fetish of the Bible; but there is a feeling that it ought to have the respect accorded to it which is always awarded to other books. The scholar who would treat Shakspeare, Milton, Dickens or Motley

as this school tortures the Bible, would be laughed out of countenance by every newspaper in America. It is an arbitrary exegesis.

III.—DOES JESUS TESTIFY ?

An Expert Witness. In the argument from science, it was conceded to Dr. Kuenen, that authority was not to settle the question. That is the authority of human opinion. The authority of facts, the testimony of witnesses, and closely knit reason must be regnant. No departure from this, the demand of science, can profit any theory. Not as king, but as a witness to the truth, can Jesus be summoned. The modern view can not object to this course, for it rests mainly on the judgment of scholars for its tenets. If the professors of theology of this day are to be accepted as witnesses, much more may we take an expert from the first century.

The authority which God exercises over men is not intended to break down reason. On the contrary that is the door to the human heart. President John Bascom says that any theory of inspiration which violates reason is immoral. So is any theory which attempts to convey truth by authority. Only two apparent exceptions exist. One is when an expert, on the witness stand, gives testimony which judge and jury are unable to test by their own knowledge. The other is where God gives a revelation of that which man could not know by his unaided faculties. Neither of these disturbs this question. Not by sheer authority, without reason, but as the peerless teacher does Jesus testify, if it is decided that he speaks on the question.

Here men divide because they do not understand each other. The new school, hoping to make the Bible clearer, stronger, have not been careful to state their position in regard to Christ. Therefore, they have been misjudged and classed as unbelievers.

Christian scholars who defend the theory say
Did Jesus Bend the that Christ did not come to teach criticism;
Truth? that it would have been far afield for him to
 have stopped to discuss questions of a literary
 or a historical nature. Therefore, some teach that Jesus accommodated himself to the views of the people. Knowing the truth, he did not distract their minds by issues which they were not prepared to meet. As he spoke of the sunrise or the ends of the earth, so he spoke of the law of Moses.

Another view is that Jesus did not know. As a babe he was not omniscient. If he were as a man, he did not say so (though Peter did), and he would not be so close to fallen man. If he did not know, of course he would not teach these lessons. Either of these two positions can be held by a Christian who believes the theory, provided he does not reason closely. That would be dangerous, for either view is besieged. There is no peace to this hypothesis.

(a). The accommodation is doubted. Jesus did not accommodate himself to the ignorance or prejudice of the people generally. He would not bend to the priests who allowed traffic in the temple courts, nor to Nicodemus, nor to the Herodians, nor to the Sadducees, nor to the Pharisees. He did not accommodate himself to the darling idea of the apostles that he would restore the kingdom to Israel. His own mother was taught that he would not accommodate himself to her cherished hope. The man who wanted him to speak to his brother to divide the estate; the disciple who wished to bury his father; those who invited him to dinner, or who warned him of Herod's designs, never found him accommodating himself to men's ignorance or whims.

He knew traditions, and stamped them as such. If P was a priestly tradition, why would he condemn "corban" and sanction the wearisome ritual? He denounced the Pharisees for numerous sins, but never for forging a law in God's name, the most daring sin which man could commit. He said: "Your fathers slew the prophets", "all the righteous blood from Abel to Zechariah", but never hinted at the important truths now revealed.

“But he used the phrase, ‘the sun rises,’ and ‘the ends of the earth’, and this is accommodation to the ignorance of the people’. Does the educated man accommodate himself to the ignorance of the people today when he speaks of the sun rising? The people are not ignorant.

Aristotle, noticing that in traveling north new stars came into view, and those in the south disappeared, concluded that the earth was round, and approximated its diameter. Jesus may have known this, yet, like an astronomer now, he would speak intelligibly.

As if to vex this theory, he does not say, “The sun rises”.

He said: "God makes his sun to rise", which is sufficiently scientific to satisfy the most captious. "The ends of the earth" meant the extreme border of the inhabited world, and not that the earth came to a point. It is heard even now.

The Master did accommodate himself to the pleading of faith, the cry of distress, and negatively, to ignorance. "I have many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now." He never positively taught or endorsed error, unless it be in the case under consideration.

(b) If he did accommodate himself in this case, then he endorsed error.

On the supposition that he knew as much as our critics do of the Bible, he permitted the sturdy Peter, the stalwart Paul, the receptive John to believe "the theories which have rendered the Bible incapable of intelligent apprehension". He used such expressions as: "Moses gave you circumcision", "Moses gave you the law", "Moses wrote of me", "if you believed in his writings", in which Moses is spoken of as a person acting. It is not like: "Have you not read in David?" where "David" may stand for the book of Psalms. One incident should be very convincing to the new critic. When Jesus quoted from 2d Isaiah he never said: "Isaiah wrote", but "this Scripture" is fulfilled. The inference is favorable to the partition of Isaiah, but it militates against the accommodation idea. He affirmed that Moses commanded, was at the bush, and wrote that history, lifted up the serpent, gave the law, etc. Seeing that J, E, D, H, P wrote the law, it is evident that Jesus taught error. He could have avoided such direct affirmations. He could have used the term "Scriptures", as he did in Luke 4, with Isaiah.

The hypothesis being true, we must unflinchingly charge the great Teacher with endorsing error about God, about the law, about the Bible and about Moses. It is a far-reaching error, too. It crippled the knowledge of the apostles, and kept eighteen centuries in partial darkness. Now, owing to the labors of men, who do not believe that Jesus was divine, we shall soon know more than the apostles did. If Jesus knew and would not tell, he was unkind as well as unwise. For:

(a). It would have paved the way for his kingdom; it would have hastened the abolition of the ceremonial law if he had taught and proved that the law was from Babylon, not from Sinai;

from P, not from Moses; the cheerful falsehood of D, not the word of God. Then Jesus would have been recognized by large numbers as a deliverer from a hard yoke of bondage. He would have been seen substituting the divine for the human.

Then in the struggle over the observance of the law by the Gentiles, how much of vexation and loss would have been saved if Jesus had not withheld the truth.

(b). An ethical principle is involved. If a finely dressed gentleman comes into the city, and is gaining the confidence of the community, with a view to fleecing it, and indubitable information comes to a citizen that the stranger is a swindler, it is his duty to warn his friends.

If missionaries from Salt Lake City should come bearing the book of Mormon, and men should begin to accept it as a revelation from God, is he not cruel who knows the truth, yet keeps silent or endorses the error?

Did not the Teacher confirm the opinion of men who said: "We know that God spake by Moses"? If that belief now renders the Bible incapable of intelligent apprehension, did not the Master withhold the truth even while declaring that he came to bear witness to the truth? Now, a theory which has its roots in Spinoza, Hobbes and Voltaire, and which was perfected by Kuenen and Wellhausen, who believe that Israel received no revelation from God other than that granted to surrounding peoples, removes these theories which stand in the way of a better understanding of the Bible.

This seems to justify the decision that either Jesus withheld important truth upon themes which were the current topics of religious belief in his day, or the theory is wrong. The stubborn opposition of the Pharisees was based on the conviction that the law was from God, by Moses. If Jesus had disabused their minds would it not have been a kindness? Was he not under obligation to teach them the whole truth?

(c). In his adaptation, he taught error. Speaking of the Messiah, he says: "Whose son is he"? **Did Jesus Use Sophistry.** They answered, "David's". "He saith unto them, How then doth David in the spirit call him Lord?" Here he affirms that David wrote the 110th Psalm,

that he was inspired, that he called the Messiah his Lord. The critics have conjectured that the 110th Psalm was not written by David. Hence the entire argument was invalid. On the accommodation basis this is nonethical. He was affirming what he knew was not true. If it be said that they thought David wrote that Psalm, and Jesus took them on that level, still it does not free him of the charge of teaching error, while it gives him a lower ethical ideal than many living men hold. There are men who would not tell a falsehood in order to convince a person of what is true. If the truth will not convince, they will not resort to untruth.

A slight change would have relieved the Master of this imputation. Once he said: "Ye believe the Scriptures. In them ye think ye have eternal life". The use of the word "Scriptures" instead of David in the above mentioned Psalm, would prevent the charge that Jesus knew David did not write the Psalm, yet affirmed that he did, attributed it to the Holy Spirit, taught error and used an argument, whose minor premise he stated, knowing it to be false.

This is the argument from the standpoint that

Did He Know? Jesus knew that E, J, D, P and other scribes wrote the Hexateuch, but did not tell even his apostles. Nor did the Holy Spirit reveal it to the friends of the Bible, it came by its avowed foes. That they should toilsomely mine the truth which renders the Bible a better appreciated volume, is marvellous. Their zeal in spreading these views thus contributing to the more intelligent apprehension of a book which they hold to be purely human, induces belief that, either they are laughing in their sleeves, or that Saul is among the prophets, and Satan among the sons of God. If that position can not be held by a logical mind then the alternative is to affirm that Jesus was ignorant of these things.

He was not always omniscient. There is no reason to suppose that the mind of a man rested in his cradle. Excepting sin, he was as human as his mother. At one period in his ministry he did not know the time of the end of the world, and at his ascension his answer implies, though it does not affirm, that the Father had not revealed the time of the kingdom to him. No one can affirm or deny his knoweldge of the existence of the

western continent, or that men would some day ride a hundred miles an hour. Yet his knowledge was never at fault. The Holy Spirit, the spirit of knowledge and wisdom, was given without measure to him. The thoughts of men and things distant were present and open. The sickness of the nobleman's son and the death of Lazarus were already known. He saw into the future. He foretold his resurrection, the fate of Jerusalem, the destruction of the world. He was familiar with things past, especially with the history of his nation. He quoted from creation, from the institution of marriage, Abel, Noah, Abraham, Lot, and various events in the life of Moses. The law of leprosy, of circumcision, of divorce, as well as the Ten Commandments, were mentioned by him. He sharply discriminated between law and tradition. Peter exclaimed on one occasion: "Lord, thou knowest all things".

It would have been an advantage for Jesus to have known the truth. He came to teach the truth, to open our minds. We rely on the interpretations of the Old Testament made by the apostles. The letter to the Hebrews contains thirty-three quotations from, and forty-four allusions to the Pentateuch. Hebrews is an old almanac when the hypothesis is in rule. Very different would have been our New Testament if Jesus had known and endorsed the theory.

Lord Bacon said: "There is no pleasure comparable to standing on the vantage ground of truth". The new critics are ardent in impressing their theory on the world, with the benignant purpose of removing the theories which render the Bible incapable of intelligent apprehension. What an immense advantage it would have been if Jesus had possessed this knowledge.

It would have prevented much of the Judaizing tendency which neutralized some of Paul's work. Galatians is occupied with that theme. The first congress was summoned to consider that alone. How crushing had been the argument if Jesus had taught that, instead of coming with the mighty presence of God on a mount that trembled, the law had been developed, "Mosaic in core and spirit", but not a line written till five hundred years after his death; that nearly half of it was only four hundred and fifty years old, and written by an unknown forger in Babylon.

The proposition that the Teacher was ignorant of the origin

of the sacred books of the Jews, staggers belief. He came to fulfill the law. He was a religious teacher and steadily refused to be diverted from his life work. To affirm that the theories he taught, through ignorance, hinder knowledge of the Bible, is to assail him precisely where he has convinced the centuries that he was superhuman. (Garfield said that Jesus had no rival.) Every man, whatever department of teaching or action he may have entered, has found a rival, except this one. No one competes with him, among enlightened nations, as the Revealer of God. To believe the assertion that unbelievers, Voltaire being first in the fulness of his assertions, came to knowledge which was denied to Jesus, in regard to the real origin of the early books of the Bible, demands more direct proof than stout affirmation.

The Master had all the data that the modern critic possesses, except archaeology, which is not loved by the new school. Then he had superior advantages. He read those Scriptures almost in his mother tongue. The Aramaic, which he spoke, is closely related to the Hebrew; so close that numerous Aramaic words are in the text. He seemed to have the Old Testament wrapped in his memory, so that any portion was at his disposal. He knew of his preexistence. His Father spoke to him. He talked with Moses in the neighborhood of Cesarea Philippi. A professed interpreter of the Scriptures, a teacher of religion, calling himself "the truth", in full sympathy with God and the divine yearning for the salvation of a lost world, is in contrast with a sneering skeptic, who denies a supernatural revelation, who is without sympathy with the heart of the Bible that throbs with the desire for the cure of man's sins. Which will be the more capable of understanding an inspired revelation? Would the knowledge, and the power to make the Bible more intelligently understood, be withheld from him who was the final prophet God sent into the world? At his feet the centuries sit, and as Dante, in Hades, rose higher so long as he kept his eyes fixed on the face of Beatrice so these weary ages rise out of doubt and captivity in precisely the proportion to the fixity of their gaze on him who is the Brightness of the glory of God.

CHAPTER XI.

THE ARGUMENT FROM PROPHETS AND PROPHECY.

The Law in the Prophets. At the request of Bishop Lightfoot, Prof. Stanley Leathes made an exhaustive tabulation of the references to, and implications of the law in the prophets. We give results in the appendix. (See Note B). Prof. James Robertson, (Early Religion of Israel) gathered from Amos and Hosea the extent of the law known to these two prophets. He found the law written and known. This argument is against the theory of Graf, which is followed by the American school; but Dillman headed a view which brought the Pentateuch before the exile. Hence the argument from the prophets would not bear as strongly against that phase.

The argument from prophecy varies from that line of thought. It is based on the axiom that, except to a very limited degree, man cannot predict.

Thomas Jefferson once wrote to John Adams that the day would come when every child born in America would be instructed in the Unitarian faith. No Unitarian now holds that to be possible. Some of them think that their work, in ameliorating the atmosphere, has been accomplished. Andrew Jackson said that nullification was the plea for disunion and the next would be slavery. Thirty years later his words came true. The sagacity of men can discern a small distance ahead, but only within narrow lines. Astronomy can predict movements of the heavenly bodies for ages. In that field prediction is of little value; for man can not change anticipated results. In life he can not prophesy with absolute certainty the result of the next election.

The framers of the Grafian hypothesis minimized prediction.

In fact, they denied it. This has its effect on the Anglo-American school, but in different degrees. They admit Messianic prophecy in general, but file exception in special cases. Dr. Briggs, in the promise to Judah that "the sceptre shall not pass from him until Shiloh come and unto him shall the obedience of the peoples be", finds no mention of Christ. He follows the LXX: "Until that which belongs to him come. And he shall have the obedience of the peoples". We think he is right. His writing is solely on critical and historic grounds. He does not name the fact that Judea was not under Judah, but under Rome, when the Christ was born, which seems to be a strong reason for admitting another reading under penalty of having a prophecy unfulfilled.

Moses prophesied of a prophet like unto himself. Here Dr. Briggs, like Philip, Peter and Paul, sees the lineaments of the Master, but Dr. Driver follows the German. He is hazy. It is in his commentary on Deuteronomy and he practically makes it to be a false prophecy. He could find no one who fills the description. "The context shows that no single or particular prophet is meant", is his retreat.

In the description of the Roman seige, Deuteronomy 28, Dr. Driver does not see the Roman. After describing the Assyrian, (after a number of verses) the writer says: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth; a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand etc". The details of the curses in that chapter number one hundred and thirty. All are prophecies. Could mortal man write them? Then God was in it, and Deuteronomy is not a forgery.

According to the hypothesis P wrote Ex. 25 to **Prophecy in Symbol.** 31. This is the building of the Tabernacle and its establishment. That necessitates a priesthood and a ritual. The prophecy is in the typical nature of the tabernacle and its service. The epistle to the Hebrews justifies this interpretation. These shadows were figures of the true. The court stood for the world, the holy place for the church, while the most holy place represented Heaven (Heb. 9).

Into the court Israel might come. There were the altar and the laver. Into the holy place, only the priests could enter. Into the most holy place, the high priest alone came but once a year.

The altar bears the sacrifice. It is the first thing the sinner meets as he starts toward heaven, and typifies the cross. "The laver of baptism" is a phrase used by Paul. Into the holy place, or the church of the living God, priests unto God are alone entitled to enter. In this the seven-branched golden candlestick typifies the light given by the Holy Spirit through the Word, and the divine indwelling. The loaves of presence find their mute prophecy fulfilled in the Lord's Supper, and the altar of incense is a type of prayer. This altar brings the worshipper nearest the divine presence in the most holy place. Our high priest has "entered once for all into the holy place".

Here is a prophecy in symbol. It was crystallized in the worship of Israel, a people (used as a pitcher to carry the water of life to the nations of the earth.) Such minute correspondence, such wondrous prophecy, could not have been by accident. The details are too many and too exact.

The new school can not advance the proposition that it was handed down by tradition from the time of Moses. Their arguments from silence and non-observance endeavor to prove that the law did not exist. If it were a tradition, it would come under the condemnation of him who made a vital distinction between what God said and the traditions of men.

The Issue.

The issue is clear. That could never have been penned by the careless hand of a reckless and mendacious scribe. He who would use freedom in making up a hundred speeches and putting them into the mouth of God, who would forge hard, heavy, grinding laws to bind on the neck of his fellow men, and say that God gave them through Moses, is a most daring sinner. To say, with Driver, that P contains elements not historical, is too feebly expressing the case.

God Did Not Inspire a Forger.

Everything about God is holy. He dwells in a holy heaven, amid holy angels. He spoke to us by His holy prophets and His holy child Jesus. The Holy Spirit can not be received by the world. It must dwell in a holy vessel. Hence Christians are called holy brethren. We read of God in a book called holy, which voices the reverence felt by men for his word.

*christian
a fruit
of god*

No prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." 2 Peter, 1:21.

Here the ways divide. The reader must choose. Go to Emmaus on the eve of the resurrection day, and your heart will burn as the Stranger transforms the Jewish altar into the cross. He unfolded the prophecies of the law concerning himself till their hearts grew strangely warm. How could an unworthy man have written such minute prophecies? The inspiration of the Scriptures is asserted by the critics of the moderate school, and that would solve this mystery. But we face the graver obstacle, the unrelenting hate of God against all sin. The Holy Spirit could not move a man of whom Dr. Driver gently affirms, that he has elements which are not historical, who has many assertions of what God said, which he did not say, if the theory be correct. Men do not need inspiration to lie. The rule with the Greek dramatists was never to bring a god on the stage, if it could be avoided. This can be, for the founders of the theory needed no god, nothing but natural development.

If God wishes to give a revelation, was not Babylon as sacred as Arabia? If he could appear to Ezekiel in the land of the Chaldeans, in the fifth year of the captivity of Jehoaehim, on the banks of the Chebar, why could he not have revealed himself to P on the shores of the Euphrates? Why this hiding behind a man who has vanished from history, leaving only a name, which name has evaporated till there remains but a letter, which letter sunk into oblivion for 2200 years, and then was guessed by unbelievers as A or Q or P? Why should that revelation need P, P2, P3, P4, P5,? If Solon was able to give laws to Athens, Lycurgus to Sparta, and Draco to Syracuse, why was not one P large enough to convey the entire law?

Moses had promised prophets to Israel, especially one like himself, who would be a law giver. For centuries prophets had preached to both Israel and Judah, denouncing them for violation of the law of God. Now if an additional law was to be given, why should this P hide behind Moses? Why date the laws a thousand years before his day, and put speeches into the mouths of God and Moses which he knew were never spoken?

Then, if as Driver says, Moses was the founder of the civil and religious life of Israel, and gave them a priesthood and ceremonial observances, how could P expect to make the people believe his

falsehoods? The Jews were not a nation of excessive credulity. They stoned the prophets. Surely their fingers would itch for stones if a man came in with 41 per cent. of an addition to their law, making it more onerous than before. Would not other prophets of the exile—Ezekiel, Daniel, 2d Isaiah—have detected the imposture? Severe are the penalties for adding to, or subtracting from the word the Lord spoke.

**Miracles in the
New Idea.**

P was a man of remarkable power. His genius approaches the miraculous, if he wrote Genesis 1 by his unaided ability. That such a supremely gifted man could have been unknown, that no contemporary or successor alluded to him, is one of the miracles of the new hypothesis. This towering genius who deceived the Jews of his time into the belief that Moses gave all the law, who deceived the King of truth, Paul, the writer of the Hebrews, Philo, Josephus and the Christian centuries, was religious to the core, and yet a lying knave. But prophecy so minute, so long before the event, was never written by mere mortal. Indubitably the institution of prophetic symbolism, the picturing of spiritual worship by altar and laver and shew bread and candlestick and incense, precisely as they were afterward ordained in the Christian church, was entirely beyond the scope of unaided human thought. It demands the illuminating Spirit.

Prof. Riehm does not admit Messianic prophecy in the Pentateuch. But Professor Briggs applies the protoevangel (Gen. 3:14 15) to the Christ. In none other of the seed of the woman has the Serpent found a foe that could bruise his head. This is given to J. Taking it as an example, out of a hundred prophecies on different topics in the Pentateuch and the query arises where did J obtain that prophecy? It is next to impossible of interpretation before the event, it is exact in its reference to heel and to head, it has an application to the atonement and to the return to a happier Eden which lift it to the azure of heaven. It is not native to Jew nor Gentile.

How could J come to the knowledge contained in that first promise of the Christ? Counting J as the oldest writer of the Bible, as some of the critics do, he had nothing before him. He is the man who wrote Genesis 2, which is, according to the critics of the new school, a second record of creation. If so, it is

decisive evidence that J was crazy. A man who would write a second account of creation four hundred years before the first record was written is a man who is sadly mixed in figures and the proprieties. It is not good form to write in that indescribable manner. There is other evidence that J was queer. Victor Hugo is choppy enough, but J is five times worse. No man of common sense would say J was inspired after reading some things he sets forth. Then, where did he obtain that sublime prophecy? It is the evening star for the race. It looks forward beyond many centuries of weariness for this sighing world to the time of gracious fulfilment. If the thought that prediction lies beyond unaided man's reach be self-evident, then this and every Messianic prediction in the Pentateuch rises up to protest against the new hypothesis. Without inspiration, they are impossible; with inspiration, falsehood and deception disappear. Then the history which the Pentateuch gives of its own origin is true.

CHAPTER XII.

THE ARGUMENT FROM PSYCHOLOGY.

Perplexities. "No difficulty emerges in theology which has not already appeared in philosophy."—*Sir Wm. Hamilton.*

We are perplexed. Undisguised enemies of revelation are said to give us a theory which makes the Bible more clearly understood.

Christian scholars accept a hypothesis which condemns the biblical history as unreliable and misleading, and defend that as a more intelligent apprehension of the book. Theological professors publish the antiquated and malodorous objections of skeptics who were buried a century or more ago, and whose feeble arguments have been crushed a thousand times.

The unbeliever wears no mask. He does not say his labors are for the benign purpose of removing difficulties in the way of a better understanding of the Bible. He is working to reduce the Bible to the level of other books.

We turn to philosophy for an explanation. Are the few Christian scholars who laud this theory the wise ones who see better than other scholars? Or are they the laughing stock of the unbelievers who are endeavoring to make the Bible an old almanac? Dr. Fairbairn says: "In Germany every speculation has its corresponding theological tendency and crisis".†

Christ in Modern Thought, p. 205.

Hegel.

With this agrees Prof. Zenos,[‡] who shows the application of the Hegelian theory of evolution to both Testaments. Hegel was a profound thinker. On his dying bed he gasped: "Alas. Only one man understands me; and he doesn't".

The Hegelian thus formulates his theory of evolution; "All growth is the resultant of the conflict of opposing forces. The appearance of any force or factor is a thesis that inevitably, and as if by its own inherent virtue, brings about the appearance of its opposite, or the antithesis. From the conflict which then ensues there emerges the union of the two forces in a synthesis."

The Tubingen school, under the lead of F. C. **Tubingen Movement.** Baur, tried to reconstruct the history of the New Testament writings, using chiefly this argument from the development of thought. The traditional view of the origin of the New Testament was set aside as unphilosophical. It was noticed that the four epistles of Paul, (Galatians, Corinthians and Romans,) were pervaded by a spirit of aggressive universalism, an interpretation of Christianity as meant for the whole world, and independent of Judaism. Here was the thesis of the movement. The Apocalypse and perhaps one or two other works were put forth in opposition to this tendency to universalize the Gospel. They were the answers of the Judaizers to the attempt of Paul in the four cardinal epistles. Here was the antithesis. The struggle was fierce. A third party arose, desiring peace. The contestants grew weary of the contest, till, toward the end of the second century, a reconciliation was effected. This was the synthesis. "It was accompanied by a considerable literary activity; and many of the New Testament books, like the Acts of the Apostles, the epistles of Peter, the non-controversial or non-doctrinal epistles of Paul, &c., are some of its permanent monuments".

The Acts of the Apostles is a notable book to the Tubingen school. It brings the great apostles together in an agreement not to oppose each other. It was written by the peace party.

This Tubingen view died from want of facts. History, so inimical to budding theories, put this in its coffin. But it had strong men to plead for its life.

[‡]Elements, pp. 234.

It was to be expected that the same philosophical tendency would appear in Old Testament criticism. **The Same Theory in the Old Testament.** Vatke, who published the development theory in 1835 "was an enthusiastic pupil of Hegel, and his view is based on the fundamental principles of the Hegelian philosophy, and the further postulate that the religion of Israel was subject precisely to the same law of development as all the other religions".

Reuss, also from the Hegelian stand point, contended that the Israelitish religion had been wrongly apprehended, that henceforth prophetism must come before Mosaism. This appears in Brigg's *Hexateuch*, (p. 161) "Law and prophecy are not two distinct and separate modes of revelation, but the same".

It was to be expected that after the theses and antitheses of Paulinissimus, Petrissimus, Particularissimus and Universalissimus, like the pterodactyls and ichthyosauri of cenozoic times, had devoured each other, the "high places" and "central sanctuary" of ancient Israel would be brought into the arena.

DeWette derided the young men "bringing in the last possible theory", little thinking that speculative thought would grow tired of his numerous editions and corresponding shifts of position, and make the new theory the question of the dying years of the century.

Bleck and Ewald wrote so vigorously against the theory that Vatke was driven back. He retracted his position. So late as 1860, Kuenen wrote concerning the view he afterward espoused: "Its arguments are not worthy of refutation."

While J. B. Lightfoot and B. F. Westcott were cheerfully turning the last screws in the Tübingen coffin, the most brilliant and forceful protagonist of the development theory, Prof. Julius Wellhausen, sprang into the ring. He perfected the theory so that W. Robertson Smith said that, after Wellhausen and Keunen, nothing more was to be done. So, Dr. Briggs says, it remains only for the ministry to accept it and to adapt themselves to it. In this theory J and E furnish the thesis, D and P the antithesis; then come later conciliatory documents, making the synthesis. The *Chronicles*, like *Acts*, are untrustworthy. It removes all traces of conflict by a false representation that it never existed.

In the Old Testament the theory has the advantage of the mist of antiquity, a longer period and scanty outside evidence.

but it labors under the stigma of defeat in the former New Testament rencounter. Nor is there the same confidence, unanimity nor courage as in the Tübingen school.

The New Testament received help from the discovery of ancient documents: "The Teaching of the Twelve", "Clement's Epistle" in full form, and "Tatian's Diatesseron". In like manner the Old Testament has been helped by the vast libraries exhumed in the past thirty years. These incorruptible witnesses were engraved by the hands of enemies. They corroborate the Hebrew records when they touch the same topics. This carries conviction that the Hebrew history is true throughout. If so, the Hegelian theory of evolution is not correct in its application to the Pentateuch.

Another theory of evolution is the Spencerian. **Spencer's Evolution.** According to this, the advance is from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, from the simple to the complex by internal forces. If not atheistic, it is deistic, but as those words are malodorous, the fresher term, agnostic is preferred.

Alexander Campbell said that between atheism and a plea for a return to primitive Christianity, there is no place for man's foot to rest. Accordingly many scholars have shown that Spencer's Unknowable has numerous attributes, and John Fiske, the American apostle of Spencer, has frankly said that the Unknowable is to be spelled, "G-O-D."

The theory runs counter to two facts, in putting the complex ritual a thousand years later than Moses, and from two to four hundred years after the more spiritual teaching of the early prophets and Deuteronomy.

One fact is that the monuments of surrounding nations reveal fully as intricate a scheme of ceremonial worship as the middle books of the Pentateuch present. The other is the trend toward simplicity in institutions and worship.

Traces of the Spencerian theory are found in Driver and Briggs; "distinctively late", "belonging to a later period of thought", "a later stage of theological reflection". These, unfolded, mean that the sentiment or action recorded could not have belonged to the time stated by the biblical history, because the theory does not permit that stage of knowledge so early.

Kuenen says that Dillman, by refusing to consider the history and relying only on literary points, reaches false results. His methods are false, his results must be false.

Dillman says that Kuenen's method begins in pure imagination of the evolution of religion, and ends in false conclusions.†

For fear that both the brethren may be right, we refrain from deciding between them.

II.—THE VIEW POINT.

Prepossessions control conclusions. Psychological difficulties prevent our completely divesting ourselves of them, though we may hope to be candid enough to accept indubitable proof.

Grapes.

Not alone in theology, but in every field, prepossessions govern conclusions. Even in the study of the grape this is so. Regel thinks there are but two species of grapes in the northern hemisphere. Munson claims that there are twenty-five species in the United States alone. Now the grapes are the same whether seen by Regel or by Munson. But Regel is not Munson. In other words, species are matters of opinion rather than of fact.†

If the assumptions of the new school be granted, their conclusions are inevitable. Kuenen and Driver may stand as the representatives of the extreme and the moderate wings. To Kuenen, the religion of Israel is one of many, purely human, nothing less, nothing more. He might have found it something less or something more if he had not predetermined the question. He says candidly and often, in effect: "The view point of the New Testament is diametrically opposed to ours."

Preconceptions.

Driver assumes real antinomies. In his preface he says the inspiration of the Old Testament is not destroyed, it is presupposed: but claims that the historical books are largely traditions, colored and modified by a later hand; that they contain speeches which were never spoken by the persons said to have made them. The middle books of the Pentateuch are crowded with speeches made by God to Moses and to Aaron. Dr. Driver labors to show that they were mostly the product of a writer in Babylon, whose char-

†Review of the History of Religions, *Hom. Rev.*, Apr 1897.

acter he permits to flash forth in the admission that P includes elements not historical. That is, he writes falsehoods.

These view points inevitably rule the eyesight. Neither of these men can see the Christ in "A prophet like unto me shall the Lord thy God raise up from among thy brethren. To him shall ye hearken in all things". They can not find the Roman in "A nation from far, from the end of the earth, swift as the eagle flieth, of fierce countenance, whose tongue thou shalt not understand". They triturate prophecy till it is valueless. They minimize the supernatural, if they do not ignore it entirely.

The Cycle of a Theory.

Given two points in the movements of a star and the astronomer determines its orbit. The philosophic student who has these two points in the movement of the development theory, ought to be able to calculate its period. The two points are the psychological genesis and the view point. Philosophical theories have a lease of life longer or shorter. Their duration is not exactly determined by time, but by the rise of a more advanced theory. A fresh theological view has a charm for men who are anxious to be counted progressive thinkers.

Whether the Anglo Saxon has too languid an interest in theological subtilties to rise up and examine the theory, or whether he has promptly seen, from its unsavory parentage and unscholarly and unprovable assumptions, that it would exert small influence, is for the reader to decide. Professor Luthardt of Leipsic wrote in 1891: "We have had too many experiences in this respect; have seen too many hypotheses come and go. Who knows what grave diggers already stand at the door? We older ones had experience in Baur's criticism of the New Testament, and some of us took an active part in opposing it. Where is that scholar now? What a stir D. F. Strauss made in his day. All who understand the matter now have abandoned the theory that the life of Jesus consists of myths. How many in Germany, even in scientific circles, compromised themselves by their attitude toward Renan's Life of Jesus? Who ever speaks seriously of that French romance now?"

In the Bampton Lectures for 1892 Bishop Barry, speaking of

the new criticism, said: "Our duty is not to denounce or ignore it, but (if I may so say) to submit it in its turn to criticism from the other side, which may distinguish in it what is proved from what is mere assumption, probable or improbable, and so refuse what in it is false, while we welcome what is true, and use it to clear our own conception of the higher truth which we hold in faith. The experience of the last half century may, I must think, read to us here lessons of encouragement. I have myself seen methods of such criticism come and go, sometimes destroying each other. I have seen results of criticism once accepted as final and imperishable, now rejected on all hands, and doctrines of revelation once scouted as unphilosophical and impossible, now allowed to be accordant with the truest and deepest philosophy" (p. 38).

Bishop Lightfoot, one of the most accomplished Hebrew scholars in many centuries, said: "There is at least a presumption (though in individual cases it may prove false on examination) that the historical sense of seventeen or eighteen centuries is larger and truer than the critical insight of one late half century. The idols of our cave never present themselves in a more alluring form than when they appear as the spirit of the age."

Secular literature has passed through the ordeal

History Repeated. to which the Pentateuch is being subjected.

That is a lesson in the philosophy of history.

Prof. Sayce says: "Twenty years ago destructive criticism had ruthlessly relegated most of ancient history to the land of night and fable. Rome, Greece and Egypt were all brought down to much later origin. Manetho and Berosus were doubted as historians, then denied existence as men."

"Niebuhs began, Havet pushed it to extremes, supported by general assumptions. One was the unlikeness of the ancient world to the descriptions of Greece or Rome given in the classics. This was built on the assumption of the inferior condition of the ancient world, in culture and education. It was taken for granted that no literature worthy of the name existed before Herodotus, and that the idea of writing history of contemporaneous events was a Greek invention. That a literary age in the east began long before it did in the west, was never admitted." So in Judges 5:14 the pen became the marshall's baton.

Critics denied movements of armies back as far as 2000 B. C. They supposed the ancients to be ignorant of geography, and without roads or communication.

Another assumption was that the language and statements of oriental writers must be measured by the standard of European writers of this day. Exactness was demanded. A single error in detail, a single inconsistency, a single exaggeration, a single anachronism was considered sufficient to overthrow the credit of a whole narrative, though it might be of the critic's own creation.

From Greece to Palestine the passage was easy. "The methods that have been employed for resolving the earlier history of Greece and Rome into myth and legend, have been turned against the ancient history of the Jewish race. Every effort has been made to show that the books of the Old Testament are a *farrago* of documents and interpolations of various ages, few of which are contemporaneous with the events they profess to record. The events themselves have been treated as the products of distorted tradition or romance, or else assigned purely mythical origin. Chedarlaomer and his allies have been transformed into solar heroes; the twelve sons of Jacob into the twelve zodiacal signs; and the conquest of Canaan by Joshua into the daily struggle of night and dawn." †Abraham was landed in the same cloud with Agamemnon, king of men.

The stones awoke. The rocks called out. Large libraries were exhumed to reinstate Homer and Moses to their rightful place in literature.

Another instance nearer home traces the genesis, the temporary success and decline of a strong movement. Wicksteed—the pupil, the friend, the biographer of Kuenen—after describing the remarkable intellectual gifts of Dr. Kuenen, tells the purpose of his forty years' teaching in Leyden. "It was an attempt of singular boldness and vigor, to shake the tradition of Christian piety free from every trace of supernaturalism and implied exclusiveness. It involved the absolute surrender of the orthodox dogmatics, of the authority of the Scriptures, of the divine character of the church as an external institution; and of course it based the

†Living Papers, Vol. 6, p. 3-4.

claims of Jesus of Nazareth to our affections and gratitude solely upon what history could show that he, as a man, had been and had done for men." (Quoted by H. Osgood, *Hom. Rev.*, 1897, p. 396).

The results in Holland were not what might be expected from the splendid talents and deep learning of Kuenen.

Wicksteed says: "1859 was the year when the movement was born. The followers of Kuenen carried it into the pulpit, the Sunday School, the journals and the class room". The Dutch gave them the name "Moderns". Sometimes a large church would have two preachers, one of the old faith and a "modern". The moderns scored a rapid success. Gradually they differed. Bitter was the struggle with the adherents of the old faith. The moderns contended for election of pastors by popular vote. It told against them. It was found that the higher classes favored them, but the mass of sturdy Dutch clung to the old faith. About 1877 Kuenen's classes began to grow smaller. Many who listened remained orthodox. Kuenen felt keenly his inability to convince honest students when to him the evidence was irrefragable. His students admitted that they could not refute his arguments, yet they felt that they were fallacious. They declined to accept the natural inferences from them. There was the underlying conviction that Kuenen was not a Christian theologian, therefore he could not fairly judge any question which touched the faith. His axioms blinded him to some things equally axiomatic to the young men.

The churches in Holland generally withheld support from Kuenen's apostles, so they are not found in the strongest and best churches today.

Kuenen wrote in 1877: "The dissolution of the traditional theory is already in rapid progress. The fortress has not yet been abandoned or formally surrendered, but the enemy enters unopposed by more than one breach, and some of the main bulwarks are either defended no longer or defended very feebly."[†]

Dr. Kuenen held that prophecy was from Israel to Israel, from God only as all things are from God. Kuenen's prophecy was from the Dutch to the Dutch. Following Israel, the Dutch refused to accept the prophesied demolition of the traditional theory.

[†]Prophets and Prophecy in Israel, p 7.

Twenty years later Dr. Briggs stood up and counted the scholars who accept the theory. Putting such avowed skeptics as Wellhausen and Vernes in line with Drummond and Geo. Adam Smith he counts 106 beside himself in the world. Europe, from Russia to England, America and Australia were counted to secure the list. In a state church, professors hold position by appointment and are independent of the suffrages of the people. Still, with all the splendid talent employed during scores of years to buttress and polish and commend the theory, it has fewer followers than Eichhorn had in the beginning of the century.

Hegel laid down the most comprehensive and **Philosophical Defeat.** exhaustive system in all philosophy. Nothing is exempt from its jurisdiction. Its influence has been vast. Law, politics, ethics, religion and art have felt its power. What discredited it, said Weber, was the a-prioristic method, giving birth to material errors, its authoritative tone toward the leaders of science, its attempt to be independent of the supreme jurisdiction of facts.

A-priori speculation is the heart of the Grafian theory.

The first chapter of Genesis is given to the **Facts Ignored.** priestly writer. There is not an item in the whole chapter which contains any sacerdotal suggestion. The facts are subjected to the speculation. Allowing one exception, modern science is at deadly warfare with a-prioristic speculation. That one exception is lucidly stated in Tyndall's monograph: "The Work of the Imagination in Science". The observing faculty collects facts; the imagination must form the hypothesis which accounts for them. The visible and tangible rests upon the invisible, the unknown. Imagination having found a theory, that theory is tested by facts. Science is despotic in its demand that a theory shall account for every fact, and reduce its knowledge to system and to law. The hypothesis which omits or warps facts is remorselessly electrocuted. Where Hegelianism resented the jurisdiction of facts, there it failed and was untrue to itself.

The history of the Tübingen school in combatting the deductions of the New Testament in respect to its own origin is being repeated in the unscientific theory of the Pentateuch and

historical books. Fifty years ago F. C. Baur's theory claimed all scholarship that was worth anything above the surface of the earth. That it had come to stay was unquestionable to its advocates. Today none is so poor as to do it reverence.

Sir William Hamilton and Principal Fairbairn, quoted above, give the psychological explanation by which the student can comprehend the origin of the new theory, its philosophical principle, and, with tolerable accuracy, the size of the circle of which its history is a segment.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE ARGUMENT FROM ART.

1.—THE SUPREME TEST.

In Tokyo, Reminyi sat for two hours, in admiration of a lacquered box sent to him from the Emperor's treasures, after a violin recital in the palace by this master of the bow. "A nation of artists," was his encomium as he left the land of the Rising Sun. No man ever said that of England or of America.

Japan has twenty-eight names for her country, nearly all poetic. We have a half dozen, all prosaic. Japan has miles of avenues of cherry trees. They have double blossoms, and, bearing no fruit, are cultivated solely for beauty. We would offer a prize for the tree bearing a double cherry rather than the multi-petaléd blossom.

Two movements have been organized to suppress art. They are Mohammedanism in the east, and Puritanism in the west. The latter influenced our ethnic character, sharpened our conscience and made us men who call the moments precious.

We take life heavily. "Ought" is the most overpoweringly ponderous word to the Anglo Saxon. Not so to other nations. The Japanese tongue reluctantly admits it, and uses it slightly. A missionary used "ought" thirty-seven times in a pamphlet. His Japanese helper, putting it into his own tongue, used "ought" but twice.

Said J. S. Mill: The Englishman follows virtue from a sense of duty, the Frenchman from an emotional aspiration toward the beautiful. The one admires a noble action because it is right, the other because it is attractive."

The softer strain in our blood from Celtic and Latin veins gives to us a sense of humor far stronger than that of our English brother.

Architectural awkwardness, solidity before grace, come natural to the English or American.

Slowly we are inclining toward the artistic. The rigid puritanic blood within us fears the result. It may at first appear doubtful whether this criterion of art be legitimate. If we succeed in our aim, it will be pronounced the most forceful chapter in the book.

Defined. Listen to the masters: "Art is the application of knowledge to any useful end."—(*Sir John Herschel*).

"The conscious utterance of thought by speech or action, to any end, is art."—*Emerson*.

"Art is based on a strong sentiment of religion. It is a profound and mighty earnestness. Art is a severe business, most serious when employed in grand and sacred objects."—*Goethe*.

"Art is the right hand of nature. The latter only gave us being. The former made us men."—*Schiller*.

Nature never made men. Nature, unaided, could not produce an apple, or a peach, or even a potato.

Nature reveals God. Art reveals man. For man's purposes the town is in advance of the country, the apple is better than the crab, the peach better than the almond, and wheat than wild rice, which is all that nature alone produced. Selection and cultivation turned the crab apple into a thousand varieties of luscious apples that now adorn our tables, the almond into peach, and made other new creations.

Two Ways of Revelation. God gave a revelation to man in the rocks and trees and animals of earth. When read, it is as plain and convincing as if spoken in words.

He gave a revelation in the sixty-six books of the Bible; a section, a peculiar section, of human history.

By the inductive method both leaves of the revelation are to be interpreted. The interpretation is a work of art; it can be tested by the canons of art. This is the crowning test. The theory which fails here fails ignominiously and completely.

When we ask what are the rules of art, the strong name of Ruskin springs to the front. Though he afterward deprecated his "Seven Lamps of Architecture", there could be no better light in which to view the contending theories. By each lamp he meant the inner spirit. The complexity and length of the study under this matter constrain us to turn to the yet more artistic French. Cousin gives the standard: The True, the Good, and the Beautiful. Toward these is America growing. Since the Centennial Exhibition, in 1876, the advance has been marked.

Any biblical theory is subject to criticism along this line. It can be true, because in harmony with the facts of history. It can be good, if it lead to faith in God's truth and confidence in his revelation. It can be beautiful, if it reveal unsuspected harmonies, if it display wisdom and adaptation requiring centuries upon centuries for their manifestation.

II.—THE TRUE.

Truth is exact harmony between a statement and facts or principles. The preceding investigation has dealt with this feature especially. First, the new theory was found to conflict with history. Dr. Kuenen in his "Hexateuch" collides with the history 170 times; the ever handy R is called in hundreds of times; P makes numerous assertions which are untrue if the theory be accurate; D is careless of facts.

There are two considerations which incline the impartial judge to favor the history. One is the faithful record of the patriarchs' drunkenness, incest, deceit, falsehoods, and the nation's frequent shame. Man does not slander his grandfather. Historians do not paint their national heroes in dark colors. There they are, in Jewish and Samaritan Pentateuch alike. Had these been written at the late date alleged, those blotches would have been left out or differently colored.

The other reason is, that the picture of patriarchal times, the exquisite reproduction of an age forever fled, must have been by eye witnesses.

Prof. W. R. Smith repeats the assertion of Thomas Paine (Age of Reason, p. 65) that Deuteronomy does not claim to be written by Moses. Dr. Driver, not giving either of the others credit, asserts it in italics. Paine, unlike other unbelievers we quote, was but a half-educated man. In his reckless way he could make

such an assertion, antipodal to the facts. Fifteen-sixteenths of Deuteronomy is from Moses directly. Twice it asserts, "Moses wrote this law". The idea that Moses could not or would not write that of himself is puerile. Thucydides, Xenophon, Josephus, Julius Cæsar, Hume, Kirk White, Cowper, Sayce, Briggs and Driver all wrote of themselves in the third person. Isaiah adopts it ten times, Jeremiah thirty; Daniel, Ezekiel and the minor prophets, Ezra and Nehemiah are acquainted with it. Matthew, John and Paul drop into it, as a literary device known to their readers. One of the most amazing sentences in theological literature is that where Prof. W. R. Smith innocently says: "One asks for proof that any Hebrew ever wrote of himself in the third person".†

†Old Testament in the Jewish Church, p. 321

Kant divided all knowledge into *cognito ex datis*, and *cognito ex principiis*. The new theory obtains its knowledge from principles, not from facts. "The science of guess work," it was termed by the London Daily Chronicle.

Sir George C. Lewis forcibly describes their **Divination of Facts.** method: "The main cause of the great multiplicity and wide divergence of opinions which characterize the recent researches into early Roman history, is the defective method which not only Niebuhr and his followers but most of his opponents also have adopted. Instead of employing those tests of credibility which are consistently applied to modern history, they attempt to guide their judgment by the indications of internal evidence, and assume that the truth can be discovered by an occult faculty of historical divination It is not enough for a historian to claim the possession of a retrospective second sight, which is denied to the rest of the world; of a mysterious doctrine revealed only to the initiated. Unless he can prove as well as guess; unless he can produce evidence of the fact after he has intuitively perceived its existence, his historical system cannot be received."†

Secondly, the hypothesis can not agree with science. The axioms of science are not elastic. The cardinal defect of the theory is its disregard of every axiom; its heart failure is the lack of facts. It frankly admits that it is not obedient to the

†Credibility of Early Roman History, pp. 13-15.

scientific method, though its honest avowal finds voice in Dr. Driver alone. To this refusal to plod along the dusty road of collating facts, and arranging into classes and a system, science severely retorts that there is no other avenue to truth. So completely does the hypothesis depart from system and consistency that E uses Jehovah 163 times, while Elohim is employed eighty-five times, before E is assigned a single verse. The theory, in declining to comply with even one axiom of science, is not yet on the road to the truth.

With so many independent students, with the freedom from rules of science, it is inevitable that divergencies should be plentiful.

Dr. Briggs says: "E uses a large number of archaic words".† Dillman allows archaic elements in J, but Driver says there is no archaic flavor perceptible in either J or E.‡ When Dr. Briggs gives the large number of archaic words of E, he submits seven as specimens. Some of these are credited to J or JE in the analysis.

The disagreements are far more numerous than the harmonies. While they agree that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, that J, E, P, H, etc., did, and that every man's theory is better than any other, that is the practical limit. Driver says there is agreement among the critics as to the limits of P. In this he is greatly mistaken. He does not agree with himself. His Int., p. 11, has Gen. 29:24-29 as P, while the analysis, on page 16, gives verses 25-28 to E. Also, 31:18b to 33:18a, he says, is P; but, excepting a half verse, it is all J or E. On this one page, in describing the limits of P, he contradicts his own analysis to the extent of ninety and one-half verses. A small error of that kind could be made by the types, but the argument here depends on the accuracy. Then Dr. Briggs attempts biblical theology. He tells what P does, or J does or never does, but the analysis changes while he is writing, so that, when he turns to it, we find that what was J has become E or P, and the doctor's carefully studied theology is all in confusion.§

The disagreements of the hypothesis cover such questions as,

†Hex. p. 74

‡Int. p. 124.

§See Note F.

Were J, E, P etc. actual individuals? What time did they live? Where? When was the Pentateuch written; before, after or partly during the exile? What are the limits of J, E, P and several Rs? How many writers were there? Did Moses write a law? Was there a revelation from God? Were the writers inspired, or was it the editors or no one? Is there prediction? Did the tabernacle ever exist?

The Anglo-American school generally concede the tabernacle in the wilderness. This dampens the theory. For a tabernacle must have furniture. The altar and the vessels must be used. This demands a priesthood, and a ceremonial law, and that written. Add Hosea 8:12, which Dr. Driver says implies the existence of written laws, and the concessions include essentially the Mosaic law.

Thirdly, in the argument from language and style, the theory does not meet the anticipations which the talents of its adherents naturally raise. The accomplished scholars who promulgate the theory are so gifted in linguistic lore, that a thoroughly scholarly and invincible argument was expected. With such wild exegesis that insures a word for an author, even though the verse must be clipped into thirds, the theory ought to have come nearer the hundreds of words possible for P. A rigid inspection gives him less than three words in each thousand verses in the Hexateuch. There is none for any other letter.

Fourthly, to understand a work, the critic must be in sympathy with the artist.

Could a farmer judge Patti's voice? One trill would reveal, to a singer, years of practice which made it possible, while to the farmer it would be a screech.

For a long time after Ruskin saw the beauty of Turner's landscapes, the British continued their ridicule.

Was Felix able to appreciate Paul? Did Voltaire know the church of Christ? Was Paine competent to estimate the Son of Mary? Was Ingersoll large enough to measure Moses? Can any man who denies the fact that God loved and sought his wandering, wounded and sobbing child, fairly criticise the Bible? Will

not that man be blind to the most essential portions of the Pentateuch who holds that the religion of Israel is as human as the teaching of Confucius? The prerequisite of sympathy being axiomatic and imperative, can any fair criticism, any just employment of critical tools, any honest weighing of facts, any discernment of the aroma of the spiritual, any appreciation of the presence of God, be expected from the crude methods of unbelief?

Prof. Ramsay speaks a fine word on this: "If **Unscholarly Critics.** I reach conclusions very different from those of the school of criticism whose originators and chief exponents are German, it is not that I differ from their method. I fully accept their principle, that the sense of these documents can be ascertained only by resolute criticism; but I think they have often carried out their principle badly, and that their criticism often offends against critical methods.

"The critic must be sympathetic, but in their investigations into religion, Greek, Roman and Christian alike, there appears to me, if I may venture to say so, to be in many German scholars (the greatest excepted) a lack of that instinctive sympathy with the life and nature of a people which is essential to the right uses of critical processes. None admires and reverences German scholarship more than I do, but it has not taught me to be blind to faults, or to be afraid to speak out."†

The entire absence of belief in any divine revelation was openly avowed by the men who projected the hypothesis. Sympathy there could have been none. A cordial appreciation of Moses and his work was as far beyond their reach as an armored cruiser is above the Chinese junk.

We submit an extract from Prof. Kuenen. What he calls the "Book of Origins" is largely Genesis. The "Yawistic narratives" are that portion of the Pentateuch called J. It will be seen that neither is of value.‡ "The contrast between the Book of Origins and the Yawistic narratives comes out with great growing distinctness. The latter are legends worked up in the prophetic spirit. The former have left tradition far behind, and give us instead the offspring of the fancy or, more often, the postulates of the dogmatic system of their author."

†The Church in the Roman Empire, Pref. p. 8.

‡Int. to Hex., p. 27.

It is not evident that a theory of the origin of the early books of the Bible by a man who came to the sacred record with a prepossession that the religion of Israel was nothing but one of the great ethnic religions, and who came away with that conclusion, has no sympathy with the throbbing purpose of the word of God?

The discord between the theory and history, the refusal to submit to the inexorable axioms of science, the distortion of the text, and the inadequacy of the argument from language and style, render the conclusion inevitable, that the new hypothesis does not conform to the first requirement of Art, that of being True.

III.—THE GOOD.

A Benign Purpose. The new theory aims at good. It proposes to write a Biblical theology, that "Thus the Bible may be restored to its true place in the knowledge and affections of all the people of God, from whose interest it has too frequently been removed by theories that made it incapable of intelligent apprehension." This is a high ambition and most worthy. It is a robust indictment of the theories held by the Teacher and Paul.

There are difficulties. The theory ought to have some unquestioned fact, some respect for history and for scientific methods. There ought to be larger consensus of opinion as to the number of writers, their time, and the extent of each writing.

The best spiritual pomologist affirmed: "A corrupt tree can not bring forth good fruit." What if this theory should be an exception? Is it not a corrupt tree?

First its roots. Celsus first denied the Mosaic **A Tree. Its Roots.** authorship. Spinoza and Hobbes filed objections which Dr. Briggs adopts. Dr. MacDill has found the elements of the theory in Voltaire. Reuss, Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen, who framed and completed the theory, never concealed their disbelief of divine revelation.

Second, its trunk. Intellectual weakness characterizes every theory of negation. This is because the universe is positive. Civilization is aggressive. The trend of history is against doubt and denial. Fault finding is cheap. It is superficial. Unbelief has enrolled some talented minds, but their arguments have been feeble.

Luther nailed his ninety-five theses to the church door at Wittenberg. Calvin, Knox, Campbell were ready to meet any disbeliever in friendly discussion. "*Athanasius contra mundum*". No braver words were ever spoken. Carlyle told Froude that if the Arians had gained the day, Christianity would have become merely a myth.

The new theory is advocated in lectures, in articles in the press, and books; but there has been a disinclination to grapple with the real difficulties in the way of acceptance of the new view. Thus Dr. Driver, whose style marks him as a genial and pleasant companion, writes eight times desparingly of the scholarship or accuracy of Canon Girdlestone, of Canon Cook (in the Speaker's Commentary,) and of Prof. E. C. Blissell, but never once does he quote an argument and refute it. The gifted W. R. Smith wrote that no attempt had been made to answer the historical argument put forth by the new theory. This is remarkable, for replies were abundant in the periodical press, and two professors, Watts of London and Green of Princeton, had written books in answer. Yet he paid no attention, in his second edition, to these courteous reviews of his former lectures.†

Branches.

Third, its branches. If the originators of this theory had held their way, this tree would have had no branches. That is, there would have been no inspiration, no prophecy; in the sense of prediction, no revelation nor miracle. The Anglo-Saxon grafted in some branches, but they have never taken kindly to the parent stock. They look withered. Thus the inspiration is by Dr. Briggs limited to the redactors, the original writers being of minor importance. All the branches are stunted.

"Inability to accept the supernatural," says Bishop Ellicott, "is the distinctive feature of the analytical system; all its results patently disclose it; all its investigations consciously or unconsciously presuppose it. . . . If the supernatural is to be minimized in the Old Testament, will it be long before the same demand will be made in reference to the New? To safeguard the miraculous in the New Dispensation, when criticism has either explained it away, or attenuated it in the Old Dispensation, will in practice be found to be utterly hopeless."

†See Note 1.

"Our point of view is not that of the church and our conclusions accordingly differ essentially from hers."—*Kuenen*.

Fruit. Fourth, the fruit. Indirectly the theory has produced good. The dying farmer in *Æsop* told his sons that he had a treasure hid in the field. This led them to dig deep; the larger crops made the treasure. So this hypothesis has caused subsoiling. But directly, it may be challenged to show one good fruit. That is, there is nothing of value that modern research has placed at the service of the student, which is not combatible with the theory of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch.

It would appear that one of the fruits of the theory is: The Bible has deceived many. For here are the brethren ready to give a biblical theology, which will promptly remove theories now in the way of a more intelligent apprehension of the Scriptures, but the greatest obstacle is the Bible. Its statements are so dignified, so uncompromising, so unequivocal, that the vast majority of Bible students pay no attention to the declarations in regard to the wonderful light about to break forth. Indeed it seems that the new theory would be buried like its predecessors, and all because of this Word.

Another evil fruit is the apology for the King.
The King Knows It All. Blackstonesays "The king never dies", "The king is everywhere", "The king can do no wrong". If such majesty hedges about an earthly throne how much more jealous should the subjects of the King of Heaven be? For the first time in 1800 years his subjects find it necessary to apologize for our Lord. They must apologize for their greater knowledge in the questions in which he claimed to be an expert. He did not know as much as Dr. Briggs. That is if the doctor knows as much as he speaks. Jesus said the Law and the Prophets. Dr. Briggs has codes of law, and mingles both in confusion. He says it should be the Prophets and Law. To the Jewish mind a prophet without a law to enforce, was an anomaly, not so to the prophets of the new era. The apology must be made for the ignorance of the Master in theological lore, or it must be for his lack of consideration. They see what an advantage this knowledge is, in unfolding the depths of the Bible, and are anxious to

impart it, therefore it is incumbent on them to explain his unkindness in withholding the information.

Another regreable fact is, that this superior revelation of the origin of the early books of the Bible, which is expected by some to supplant the historical record, was rocked in a naturalistic cradle, and reared in a skeptical home. To this might be interposed as good fruit, the zeal with which unbelievers join hands with Christian scholars in spreading the new light, Voltaire being among the prophets, and Kuenen with the sons of God.

The next bad fruit is the low estimate placed
Low Bible. on the Word of God. Thus Prof. W. Robertson Smith says: "The supposed Mosaic ordinances and the narratives that go with them are unknown to the history and the prophets before Ezra; they are unknown to the Deuteronomic writers, and they are unknown to the non-priestly parts of the Pentateuch which Deuteronomy presupposes, and from this it follows with certainty that the priestly recasting of the origins of Israel is not history, but Haggadah, *i. e.* that it uses old names and old stories not for the purpose of conveying historical facts but solely for the purposes of legal and ethical instruction."†

It is deplorable that so gracious a soul as that of Prof. W. R. Smith should consent to so degrade the early records of the Bible. The necessity arises from the search for a word between "truth" and "falsehood". When the ordinary Bible student is told that Moses did not write a line of the Pentateuch, but that it was written by men, in his spirit, several hundred years later, he styles the work "a forgery" or "falsehood". The evangelical critic does not like these hard words. Hence arises the search for a word mediate between "truth" and "falsehood". For the critic can not say that such expressions as "Moses wrote this law", "Moses wrote of me" are true, without either a mental reservation attaching to the word "true" a different meaning than his interlocutor does, or denying the theory. "Fable", "parable", do not answer. "Legends colored and modified" is Dr. Driver's suggestion, while Prof. Smith says "Haggadah". The Haggadah are the anecdotes of the Midrashim, which are comments on the Old Testament written by the Jews who rejected Christianity. They date between 200 and 1100 A. D.

†Old Testament in the Jewish Church, p. 420.

The collection is, according to Eidersheim: "A terrible mass of utter incongruities and conflicting statements and too often debasing superstitions, the outcome of ignorance and narrow nationalism; of legendary coloring of Bible narratives and scenes, profane, coarse and degrading. The Almighty himself and his angels taking part in the conversations of rabbis and the discussions of academies; nay, forming a kind of Heavenly Sanhedrim, which occasionally requires the aid of an earthly rabbi. The miraculous merges into the ridiculous and even revolting. Miraculous cures, miraculous supplies, miraculous help, and all for the glory of great rabbis, who by a look or a word can kill and restore to life."

Oddities. The positions taken by the excellent men who advocate the theories are sometimes open to criticism. Dr. Briggs says that Elijah conducted ancestral worship on Mt. Carmel. Wellhausen denied the record which brought back Manasseh to his throne, and even refused the testimony of the monuments.

Prof. Cheyne wrote a book to show the value of that line of criticism; the title is "The Hallowing of Criticism". It is some sermons on Elijah. It fails to reveal the way in which the method adopted by Prof. Cheyne brings out any hallowed results not in the path of the old theory.

Prof. S. Ives Curtiss, in the *Congregationalist*, in 1898, wrote "Contribution to Knowledge by the Higher Criticism". There is nothing new that is valuable. "Gen. 29:2: What the shepherds were wont to do in watering their flocks." The knowledge imparted lies in the word "wont". But no one would think that the shepherds watered their flocks only at rare intervals, or only once in a lifetime, and the marvel is that Jacob happened there just in time to kiss Rachel. No wonder he wept.

"2 Sam. 15:30, 32": David, fleeing from Absalom, went up Olivet, "went where he was wont to worship". That is, he was accustomed to worship. But that was known. Here come three truisms:

1. "Prophecy was something far more than actual history foretold; it was, in fact, an education for future history". A student will often strike a truth and think it never was in the world before. Mark Hopkins used to teach that when Prof.

Curtiss was a little boy. He never bulged it out so as to hide predictive prophecy.

2. "It unfolds a progressive revelation in the Old Testament." That is much older than Mark Hopkins. Moses foretold the coming of a greater prophet. Jesus compared revelation to the growth of grain. The development of the people into deeper appreciation of the law, is confounded, by the new school with development of the law from their own experience. The analogy is found in the gospel age. The revelation of the gospel was perfect and entire. It was imperfectly understood. Paul amplified its meaning till it easily accepted the Gentile, without regard to the Mosaic law. Since that time the development has proceeded in zigzag lines, but the gospel lies as written by the original eight writers.

3. "Messianic prophecy is not revelation of the person of Christ but rather of a Messianic ideal". This is borrowed from the Jews of long ago. Then this position is ancient in the theory itself. Prof. Riehm speaks as a stalwart, in the ranks of the advanced school. The late professor of theology at Halle speaking of Messianic prophecy says "it is its ultimate reference to Christ which in the intention and decree of God, gives it its place in historical revelation. . . . The decree of God, fixed before the foundation of the world, that Christ should assume the central position of sole mediator of all salvation in the Kingdom of God and in humanity, implied that all prophecies, proceeding from whatsoever different starting points should, from the first, point toward Him, should converge towards Him as rays of light to their focal point and find in and through Him their unified fulfillment."†

Dr. Briggs also testifies: "It seems to be necessary to think of the seed of the woman culminating in an individual victor, who is to be the champion of the race and gain the final victory over the serpent. . . . In the fulness of time this gives birth to the second Adam, the Redeemer". On Isa. 53d he says: "This prophecy of the servant who dies and rises from the grave, finds its only fulfillment in the death of Jesus Christ and in his resurrection and exaltation to his heavenly throne."‡

Thus Prof. Curtiss appears to be belated in his interpreta-

† Riehm: *Messianic Prophecy*, pp 296-7.

‡ Briggs: *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 76, 77, 363.

tion. These quotations justify the claim that while diligent students have accepted the theory and have given treasures of knowledge there is little or nothing that is inherently connected with the theory which is of value.

That Tired Argument.

A brilliant lecturer in the University of Chicago was announced to speak on "Some Recent Movements in Germany in Biblical Criticism".

Having just returned he was expected to speak on Prof. Harnack's position, which the N. Y. Independent heralded as a return to the conservative ranks, or the similar attitude of Prof. Julicher, or the recent work of Pastor Rupprecht of Strasburg, which was counted as a resurrection of Keil. None of these were named, but the charming speaker, with an unapproachable diction, played the weary tune on the frayed cords of silence and non-observance.

It may be doubted, if at that time the gifted speaker had read any conservative work. A glance he may have given at titles or have read reviews, but from a remark quoted below, and his argument, the deduction would be that he did not know their resources. Being a deeply conscientious man, alert and fertile in thought, the probability would be, that an under current of thought would have accompanied him, if he had known the strength of the traditional side. Thus: "Now you know that these arguments twenty years ago were proved to be inconclusive. The major premise which you suppress viz: silence concerning law, or infraction of the provisions of a law is proof that the law does not exist, you would not accept if applied to the history after the Return, nor to the New Testament in the Dark ages. Then why deal in unfair argument? Is it not to wound oneself, by self-inflicted sophistry?" Such under current of thought would come to some speakers. The lecturer was afterward asked if the conservative did not object to having the Bible treated like other books. He replied "Yes". This is decisive proof that he had read no conservative work with care, for they say precisely the opposite, and it would wound that lecturer to think that he had done any man or cause, injustice. The following quotations express the attitude of the traditional school.

"Upon the very threshold I embrace in what I think a substantial sense, one of the great canons of modern criticism, that

the Scriptures are to be treated like any other book in the trial of their title".† Gladstone regarded it as a settled rule.

"No objection can be made to the demand that the sacred writings should be subjected to the same critical tests as other literary productions of antiquity".‡

Fear Naught- "I place no barrier against criticism, the most searching and impartial; by all means let us treat the Bible like any other book. I ask for no reservation in its favor".§

In dealing with the Bible: "We must adopt methods and rules of criticism which are applicable to other books of the same age and class, so far as we can find them".¶

Bible Harshly Treated. Unwaveringly the traditionalist has objected that the method applied to the Bible by the new school was not countenanced in literature; that no other book has a polychrome edition; no other author is minced into bits of verses as the critics do Moses. The use of antiquated arguments which have been abundantly answered tends to bring a theme into ridicule. The lecturer will feel that some one in the audience may know that his arguments have been torn to shreds, and that he is ignoring refutations complete and unanswerable. That unnerves a sensitive man.

A by product of this attitude may be stated in the words of Whipple: "A politician weakly and amiably in the right is no match for a politician pugnaciously and resolutely in the wrong". So the theory is in no condition to meet success. It fears discussion, it shrinks from meeting solid arguments (see Note I), while the traditional side is aggressive and fearless of investigation.

Prof. S. Ives Curtiss told the readers of the *Congregationalist* "the literature, the history, the accounts of religion as set forth in the Old Testament—almost everything needs rearrangement".

That is a bold proposition. The Bible is not arranged like a multiplication table, nor in the form of a catechism. The mingling of the abstract with the concrete; the laws springing out of

†Gladstone: *The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*. Preface.

‡W. H. Green: *Moses and the Prophets*, p. 11.

§Stanley Leathes, Prof. of O. T. Literature, Kings College, London.

¶R. B. Girdlestone. *Living Papers*, Vol. 10, p. 5.

the history; the principles of the Reign of God emerging in actual deeds; do not these make the Bible forever new and alluring? A dry, scientific treatise on morals and religion would have perished long ago. Further, very little would be left to the world after the critical erasure. The myths, the traditions, the idealized history, the made-up speeches, the legends being taken out according to their designation, the remainder would be worthless leaves.

Dr. Driver, in his "Sermons Connected with the Old Testament", gives this counsel: "The preacher ought no longer to say 'the Word of God'. He should add some qualifying phrase, as 'mediated by human agency'. Only thus does he express the real truth". This exhibits the non-practicability of any suggestion from the new hypothesis.

If the distinction be clearly made between the theory and the labors of individual scholars in the same fields; if the theory is separated from higher criticism with which it has no vital connection; if the stimulation to study be remembered; then, as to the residue, it is not an unjust judgment to deny any good inseparable from the theory. That is to affirm that the theory which claims that Moses is not the author of a line of the Pentateuch, for that was written by various letters, from five hundred to one thousand years after Moses, brings nothing of value to the intellect or heart of man. It thus fails to accord with the second rule of Art.

IV.—THE BEAUTIFUL.

Beauty in Names. "The beautiful is as useful as the useful".—*Victor Hugo.*

Man believes the true, hopes for the good, and loves the beautiful. Rhetoricians tell us never to construct ornament, but to ornament construction. As Emerson states it, the beautiful rests on the necessary. Art educates the perception of beauty. It is a fair demand on these rival theories that they shall meet the craving for the beautiful. In the traditional view we meet with beauty. The deeper the study the more profound the admiration. Even names, which, in a wooden interpretation are as unpoetic as plow handles, flash with beauty. Every divine name blazes with an attribute and a revelation of the nature of our God.

According to Bengal, "Jehovah" is a composite word, from *havah*, "to be", "to live". It embodies three tense forms, the past, the present, the future. This is criticised by present day grammarians who find the Hebrew more indefinite in tense. However, the idea reappears in the Greek. Rev. 1:8: "The Lord God who is, who was and is to come." Gesenius paraphrases Exodus 3:14 thus: "I (ever) shall be (the same) that I am (today)." When Eve brought forth her first born she thought of the promise and prophecy, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head". She did not say, "I have gotten a man by the help of the Lord". Her piety was not so highly developed. There is no word answering to "help" in the Hebrew, and "by" is really "*eth*"—the sign of the accusative. It is used as such in the same verse, "she bore (*eth*) Cain". What Eve said was that she had Jehovah. But Jehovah was not then used as the name of God. Translate, instead of transferring, Jehovah and Eve said, "I have gotten a man the one to be". "The Coming One" who was to restore Eden, was her hope. That hope was turned to night by Cain, but the star shone. The hope of the race was crystalized in prayer. "Then began men to call on the name of the one to be." Thus this name was coined on earth. God looked in pity, drank of the love in human hearts which sprang from faith in his promise, adopted that name, revealed it unto Moses, and manifested the tenderest attributes of his nature under that title. Then the New Testament identifies Jesus with Jehovah.

Compare that with the neo-critical view, that Jehovah was a windgod, with headquarters around Mt. Sinai; that the Jews offered him larger territory, if he would go with them, and eventually made him the god of the entire earth. How feeble, compared with Eve's exultant cry, man's steady hope, and the Bush that burned but was not consumed.

No item inseparable from the new hypothesis, can compare with this exegesis. In contrast, Dr. Kuenen has sixty-five opprobrious epithets applied to the early books of the Bible. These are used hundreds of times in his "Hexateuch". Dr. Driver uses more refined terms, but they are equally subversive of the integrity of the Book. These are not pretty.

2. There is no beauty in mutilation. Utility
Hasty Criticism. there may be. To save life, to build better, mutilation or destruction is defensible. Prof. Cheyne called the Graf-Wellhausen theory a "disintegrating theory". Its opponents have styled it a destructive theory; to which the new critics object, and we have not used it. Yet destruction may be demanded. Not unless the more beautiful building is in sight. Ingersoll was fairly criticised on that ground. He would tear down, but offered no substitute. Sociologists are met with the objection that they have no practical program. Denunciation is easy. To see evils in society does not require supernatural eyesight. He is the true prophet who waits till he has thought out a remedy. Difficulties there are in the Pentateuch and in the historical books of the Bible. But to cut down the forest in order to trim the branches is hasty. Then some one is liable to get hurt. Kuenen said that Dillman reached false results. Dillman answered that Kuenen's method and results were both wrong. The conservative agreed with both. Nevertheless, the destruction of Moses as a writer of the Pentateuch; of the truthfulness of all the early accounts of the race; the chopping of verses and the invention of ghosts as writers; fanciful creatures with nothing left of even their names but the first letter, and that fictitious, are not beautiful. The theory slices verses into bits, chops up chapters, and carves the Hexateuch into 295 scraps.

Dr. Bacon presents the Hexateuchal writers thus:†

$$\frac{(J \text{ -- } E) \text{ -- } D \text{ -- } (P1 \text{ -- } P2 \text{ -- } P3)}{(Rje \text{ -- } Rd \text{ -- } R)}$$

The numerators are the original writers, the denominators are the editors and compilers. Dr. Briggs testifies that Pentateuchal criticism is extremely intricate and complicated.

Prof. Cornill of Berlin presented his row of the writers of the Hexateuch as J1, J2, J3, E1, E2, D, Dh, Dp, P1, P2, P4 (a substitute for P3, P4, P5, etc.) Rj, Rd, Rp, and some straggling scribes. Not every professor is so facetious. Prof. Dillmann, the leader of the moderate wing of the advanced criticism, and the most talented of all, says in his commentary on Exodus and Leviticus, "I can do nothing with Q1, Q2, Q3, E1, E2, E3, J1, J2, J3, and I can see therein nothing but hypotheses of embarrassment." Embarrassment is not beautiful.

†Genesis of Genesis, p. 66.

3. There is no beauty in deception. Yet these letters did write the most deliberate and abundant falsehoods. They made them more numerous than was necessary. Dr. Driver thinks they ought not to be adjudged harshly, because other men did the same. That other men invented laws and gave revelations in the name of Jehovah may be questioned. That other men told falsehoods is true; but that would only show that Dr. Driver's ideal of ethics might be improved. The Jesuit lies for the glory of the church; these men seem to have written falsely for their own amusement. No one knows their names or postoffice address; they did not write for fame. There is not the least shade of evidence that they ever existed; indeed, the last mail indicates that they did not. At all events, a lie is ugly. It has no element of permanent prosperity; it leads to others; it breeds worse things. Hebrew grammars and Bible dictionaries ought to be impassive. Commentaries may have a bias, for they are recognized as the product of a school or an individual. To the praise of scholarship, it has in the past carried itself so loftily that it was a dignity. In that day grammars and lexicons were as indifferent to partisan warfare as a mirror to wrinkles or beauty.

The second American edition of Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar, by Dr. Mitchell of Leland University New Orleans (1898) reveals its one-sidedness.†

Scribner's Bible Dictionary edited by Dr. Hastings of Edinburgh is strongly biased. That may be the trend, so that both sides will be obliged to issue the works which have hitherto been far above the storm, but it is a degeneration of scholarship. The agent does not tell the young preacher that the Bible dictionary is written for the advancement of the unproved opinions of a small guild, so he is led to believe that that is current among scholars. Dr. Hastings runs to fall down before the scoffer. He is like the British captain who surrendered to John Paul Jones, on the threat of the latter to blow him out of the water, and found that Jones had only three serviceable guns to his fifteen. Dr. Hastings weakens as soon as he sees the flood. He hastens to apologize that it is one of the many stories found in the folk lore of all peoples.

He strikes colors to the weak, but boastful unbeliever, on the

†See pp. 399, 439

genealogy of our Lord: "By thus throwing all the burden of inaccuracy on Matthew we may reserve a possibility of accuracy for Luke." In regard to the Pentateuch and Daniel, the work is lopsided. A more manly course would have been to have given each side equal space. There is no permanent gain by such devices. The Britannica set the example. It is pernicious; it is temporary. Whether in church or state, works of reference ought to be impartial, either by a presentation by a lofty and unprejudiced mind, or by the strongest protagonist on each side. Any other course is unmanly and far from beautiful.

4. There is no beauty in weakness. It is surely
Weak Boasting. weakness to shrink from discussion, and to constantly boast of scholarship. It may be doubted if the most solid scholars ever laud their attainments. On the contrary, the larger the circle of knowledge, the more extended is the line of conscious ignorance. History will probably justify the prediction that an assertion like, "In the field of scholarship the question is settled" may be taken as an attempt to conceal conscious defeat. Voltaire is the father of those who claim modern scholarship as all on their side. He boasted that it took twelve men to establish Christianity but he would show that one man could tear it down. He proposed to do so by the end of the eighteenth century. Eichhorn expected the universal acceptance of his theory in twenty years. There have been many such prophets.

The intellect, like Ithuriel's spear, reveals the presence of evil. Reformers from Paul to Henry George have nailed their theses to the door and welcomed the light. Whether scholarship was with them or not was a secondary consideration.

That the hypothesis is one of fancy, not of
Feeling Not Logic. fact; of feeling, rather than firm reasoning, appears in the general tone of the books issued by that school. Dr. Driver has a quotation of a law; first its general statement, then its specific enactment, and says: "Can any man read these two and not feel that several centuries elapsed between them?" Certainly, there are a number of men who think the sojourn in the desert long enough to account for such perfected regulations. His test is feeling. So he often suggests that "it must be so", "it can hardly be possible".

"Feeling" is a poor substitute for facts. This confirms the fear that the able men who framed this theory did not invest intellect in it. It is fanciful, it is sentiment, but it is superficial. The tug of debate, the strain of scientific investigation, the unalterable demands of logic are too much for it. Some may be pleased with its emotional phases as it floats in the zephyr of refined sensibilities adorned with the hues of gorgeous rhetoric, but it no sooner collides with the intellect than it is shivered to atoms like a bubble driven against a stone wall. There is no beauty in weakness, where strength is rightly demanded. As a work of art, the theory should have intellectual coherence; should be articulated by inexorable logic; should convince the understanding instead of appealing to feeling; and should establish a fact rather than float on speculations. To show that the Hexateuch can be divided into 295 sections; that several authors can be imagined to have written these scraps; to suppose that redactors put them together, lose all force when unsupported by evidence that the imaginations are facts, and when confronted by the truth that any voluminous author can be dissected in the same way.

5. There is no beauty in absurdity. The truth cannot be ridiculed. It must be caricatured first. The new school tells us to read the separated documents and note that each makes a connected study. In J we learn that some one called the Lord, Noah; that after the rain was on for forty days, the Lord shut Noah in the ark; that Jacob lay with a field and defiled her. During all the time of the stirring events after the flood our sympathy is with Noah, for J never says that he went out of the ark, though he does have his three sons go forth.

P has his antics. He says that God looked upon all he had made and it was very good. Then he informs us that the earth was corrupt before God and full of violence. Writing 400 years after J, he took Noah out of the ark. We are glad of it. From P we learn, "The Lord did unto Sarah as he had spoken at the set time of which God had spoken to him." This turns Sarah into a man, which must have been embarrassing to the patriarch. It is in the analysis.

Don Quixote.

The theory is singularly gifted in awkwardness. It is the Don Quixote of theology. The Anglo-Saxon school makes a good Sancho. The windmill emerges promptly. It is in the second stage of the journey. To the wild vision of the doughty knight, the second chapter is a second account of creation. It resembles it as closely as a windmill does a mounted warrior. Sancho would fain protest that there is small resemblance, title, contents, order, purpose, all so very different, but Sancho is not the framer of this comedy. After the contest, Sancho bathes the wounds of the worsted knight with the arnica of "Modern Scholarship".

Graf wrote arguments, which can not be refuted, showing that D was acquainted with the narratives of the four preceding books. He sat down to rest with the satisfied air of a man who has done a good job. But Prof. Riehm objected, and Dr. Kuenen wrote to Graf in the politest French that the narrative ought to have the late date given to the laws. Graf arose, replied to Dr. Kuenen in the same suave tongue, and pulled the narrative down to the time of the laws. His arguments against that position have never been refuted. Argument does not stand in the way of changing a theory to suit a friend, except with the stiff, unobliging traditionalist.

W. R. Smith, commenting on the flexibility, says that the language and style were not considered a barrier. The traditional theory cannot be turned inside out in that way. Pull Genesis 1 down to Babylon, and you tear the Mosaic theory all to pieces. It is like a lily: it has form; and its beauty and system yea, its life, depend on that form being intact. A hydra can be taken from the water, turned inside out, thrown back again and it goes on living as though it had merely passed through house cleaning. So this theory. Turn it wrong side out, it is as fresh and useful as before. Cut a hydra in two and each part will start a new family. So Astruc's conjecture has been cut into many a theory, each one as good as the other, and declared to be better. Slice the Hexateuch into 295 pieces, and the theory enjoys it; but it would be the death of the traditional hypothesis. It is articulated. Stand it on its head and its life is gone. It is vitally connected with times and places, with the exodus, with Sinai, with the Jordan, with facts. It breathes, it stands erect and is fear-

less. It is part of a mighty system which covers time. Not a section can be cut out without causing it to bleed.

Admiration is deep for the humility with which the men who adopt the Graf-Wellhausen theory adapted themselves to the change. They tore up the ponderous review articles they had prepared to prove Graf's first position and wrote others to show that the trend of modern scholarship was unquestionably toward the view that the narratives were later than Deuteronomy. As he turned the theory around, saying: "This is what you believe O Modern Scholarship," the joy was too exultant to notice the collision between arguments and theory. When it left Germany it was like Jeroboam's day; when the calves were made, the cry went forth, "Behold thy gods O Israel". So when the hypothesis crossed the channel, the brethren, who thought they were the scholarship of the day, greeted the new view in what ever way it came. Whether it advanced like the kine of Bethshemish, head first, lowing like a calf, or came head last, kicking like the bulls of Bashan, the Angles and Saxons rubbed their hands with glee, congratulating each other upon the amazement with which the world would look upon them, the advance guard of the new treasures. Graf died, or it might have come sideways ere now.

Nirvana.

As the eighteenth century, according to Carlyle, blew out its brains in the French Revolution, as Positivism was wrecked on Madame De Vaux, as the denial to Cicero of his four Catilinarian orations stranded on the rocks of absurdity, as the Wolfian attack on Homer was summed up in the conclusion that the Iliad and the Odyssey were not written by Homer, but by a blind man who lived in the same place at the same time, and whose name was also Homer, as Cheyne's theory of the authorship of the Psalms puts common sense out of doors by denying them to David, then saying it is necessary to invent another David to write them,† does not the Grafian hypothesis make a holocaust of reason and experience when it claims that it, the child of skepticism and sneers, will remove theories which have made the Bible incapa-

† "I do not deny that the author of these older songs may themselves have been influenced by some earlier hymnist. Indeed, I feel bound to assume the existence of a David using the name in a symbolic sense) subsequently to the poet-king to account for the literary character of the Book of Amos. . . . The grand fault of the elder orthodoxy is that it identifies these two Davids,"—Psalms, p. 194.

ble of intelligent apprehension, and does it not reach Nirvana in its affirmation that E, J, D, P are not individuals, but a procession? Is there anything beautiful in this theory aside from the flowers of its rhetoric?

Art thus finds the development theory inadequate to meet the requirements of the True, the Good, and the Beautiful.

Far more attention has been paid to the Pentateuch than to all the other portions of the Scriptures, partly because that elsewhere the questions have but literary interest, partly because this colors all. The acceptance of the development theory would in the vast majority of minds lessen respect for the Word, and even reflect on the Christ. This theory conflicts with direct statements in both Testaments so that the evangelical critic must have methods of exegesis which hold him firmly to the revelation through Jesus Christ while he cleaves to a theory which it seems evident Jesus did not believe.

We yet believe that a man can be an earnest, gifted, devoted Christian and yet adhere to the theory, but it now appears that he cannot do that and be a rigid logician. He yields too promptly, he grants assumptions which are as Fortress Monroe to Washington. The major premise slips past him unchallenged. Otherwise he would deny probative force to the reasoning from silence or from infraction of law. Nor can the perfectly poised intellect, leaning in neither direction consent to treat the Scriptures with indignity. As Bishop Stubbs has well said this unique volume should be regarded with the respect which its lofty claims justify.† It has successfully resisted many hammers and files, but the end of the nineteenth century sees the most peculiar attack, when cultured and most estimable scholars advocate a theory which subverts the foundations of their hope.

Place the two theories in contrast. The sublime introduction, the orderly sequence, the perfect symmetry, the vast and comprehensive plan, the divine purpose, the majestic march and the complete control of nature and of nations, manifested in the biblical theory, are in vivid antithesis with the stumbling at the very first verse of Genesis, the doubt whether the oldest verse of

† "We can not treat the Scriptures like any other book, even if it were susceptible of such treatment, but it is like none other, and indeed it is the fact, that it is like no other which has led the critics to apply to it methods of arbitrary, wanton and conjectural criticism which, applied to Greek or Roman or even Anglo-Saxon literature, would be laughed out of court."—Bishop Stubbs's Charge, p. 11.

the Bible is "After these things God appeared unto Abraham" or "In the day that God created the earth and the heavens", the fancy that there are two discrepant accounts of creation put together by an inspired dunce, the oscillation through the early books with the constant detraction and the failure to comprehend the grandeur of those primitive literary monuments of our race. Place the supposed writers in contrast with Moses. They are shadows. The books they are said to have written know them not. In defense of their moral character, it is affirmed that they wrote in the spirit of Moses. How could Moses have so many spirits that the critics see different men in the different portions. If Deuteronomy differs so strongly from Leviticus as to require two writers how can it be claimed that both wrote in the spirit of Moses? Surely there is confusion of thought and great difficulty in persuading these spirits to stand up long enough for inspection.

Moses is one of the princely giants of the race. **The Height of Moses.** Reared in the wisdom of an Egyptian palace, disciplined in the desert, leader and lawgiver of millions of stubborn blood, talking face to face with God, reaching one hundred and twenty years with undimmed eye and strength unabated, he summons heaven and earth to hear the song of the dying swan of Israel ere he sinks back into the arms of God to be smothered with kisses of love and to be buried by the careful hand of his Maker. Shall he be shoved off the earth by a nescient theory which does not allow him a verse in the mighty law he gave to Israel?

Thirty-four hundred years have passed. Only once since his death has he been seen upon this earth; but he lives. His arm reaches across seas and centuries; his hand moulds every civilized nation; his breath is in many a statute, his spirit in every institution of mercy toward the poor or stranger or fatherless.

His clear eye beheld the panorama of creation; his bold pen wrote "In the beginning God"—the sublimest words ever penned by man. He records the birth of the universe, when the congealed breath of the Almighty crystallized into the jewels of the firmament, when their Creator called the stars by names and marshalled them for their tireless advance across the plain of time. He describes the creation and nature of man, whose worth is greater than that of all stars. Then, in gentler, more compas-

sionate words than in the stately creation phrases, this matchless author leads us to see the all-Father, building a home for his child, teaching him to talk; and, while the morning stars sang together and the elder sons of God shouted for joy, joining the first man and woman together in the bowers of Paradise, the fragrance of whose roses we inhale in wedded bliss. Then in stern yet pathetic tone is recited the temptation and the precipice, gilded with the promise and prophecy of the Coming One.

Of all animals, man alone knows heartache; of all books, the Bible alone reveals how death came into the world, trailing sorrow; in all literature Gen. 2 and 3 alone can tell why man mourns and woman weeps. Convince man that these are Haggadah, the mumbling anecdotes of men who said anything except their prayers, and night broods over every hope.

Men of Mathematical mould may read in these a literal record; those of finer poetic vein may see beautiful symbols given to vindicate God's ways to man and to explain our tears; but he who turns from these sad and touching lines, who would discover the fountain of man's woes, or soothe the wounded heart, is surrounded with impenetrable gloom and is dumb, or speaks hollow words to human grief. Those pages are essential to reveal the heart of God, to show man the source and the cure of his unrest, to explain the rivers of blood which flowed from Jewish and Gentile altars, to paint the dark background which dimmed heaven, which clothed earth with night, that out of the thick darkness the jewelled Cross of Golgotha might flash forth with the brilliancy of that light which never shone on land or sea, but which will some sweet day illumine the earth, and sweep sorrow from the presence of God's own.

CHAPTER XVI.

DANIEL IN THE DEN OF CRITICS.

Daniel has been over lionized. Friends and foes have tried to tear him to pieces. Hobbyists have ridden him till he was weary, while the know-it-all critics have carved him up scientifically. He did not encounter trouble in entering the canon; it has been in the critic's den that he has been worked overtime by enthusiasts and given a quietus by Celsus' band.

There are difficulties in the interpretation of any of the Old Testament books, and interpretation affects higher criticism.

In the book of Daniel, the text is in doubt. By some the eleventh chapter is regarded as an interpolation. From the beginning of the answer of the wise men (2:4b) to the end of the seventh chapter the Aramaic language is used. This, wrongly called Chaldee, is as near to Hebrew as Italian is to French. The writer was able to write in either tongue. The Aramaic was coming more in vogue, and became the language of the Jews. The Hebrew we have is late. It goes back no farther than the Massorites, "the possessors of the tradition". They were a body of Jewish scholars. The Hebrew had been written in consonants only, like signals at sea are today. Since the Hebrew ceased to be spoken some 400 years before Christ, the Massorites perpetuated the pronunciation among themselves. In the century, 600 to 700 A. D., they inserted the vowel points. The latest manuscripts known, date from the tenth or eleventh century. The true reading is, in some places, in doubt.

The LXX was begun under Ptolemy Philadelphus (284-247). Behind it for Daniel there was evidently a different Hebrew and Aramaic text than that which the Massorites followed.

Theodotion, about 180 A. D., wrote a Greek version in Asia Minor. It varies from the LXX.

The Peshito, a Syrian version, about the same as Theodotion's, claims to have been translated directly from the Hebrew. The Vulgate is Jerome's Latin version of our era. He went to Bethlehem that he might have the help of Jewish rabbins.

While these questions of text belong to lower criticism, yet the fact that the copyists have been freer with the book of Daniel than with the law, and the additional fact that interpretation of this book largely influences the question of date, make the examination of the text of great importance.

The LXX has additions to the book of Daniel—*i. e.*, "The Song of the Three Holy Children", "Bel and the Dragon", and "Susannah". They can be read in the Apocrypha, often published with family Bibles.

Neither side mentions the real issue. The attack on Daniel arose from an attempt to subvert Christianity. The defense came because of the forcible prophecies which were used to advance the Cross. Now the case is complicated by four parties being in the field.

(*a*). Those who hold to the old view, which makes Daniel the writer. (*b*). The party of objectors to Christianity who deny that it is anything of truth or of prediction. (*c*). Those who hold it to be fiction, a religious novel. (*d*). Those who view it as a production of late date—the preceding class does that—written to encourage the Jews of the time of the persecution of Antiochus, with the facts all imagined.

The Pilgrim's Progress and Uncle Tom's Cabin are the analogues for those who view it as fiction.

While the argument is literary there is a deeper current of interest, and on account of the difficulties which surround it, we may hope no more than to fairly present the arguments offered. Two sides are all that need presentation. If the view that Daniel is based on fact, written at a late date be true, it is merely a question of opinion whether it is to be called a religious novel or a recital of distant facts and predictions.

Antiochus, who is so important to one side, ascended the throne in Syria, in 176 B. C. The next year he sold the high priesthood of the temple to Jason, taking it from Onias III. Three years later he sold it to Menalaus who outbid Jason. Onias

III is supposed, by some to have been murdered by the officers of Antiochus. Three years later Antiochus made an expedition into Egypt. Returning, he entered the temple, carried off many vessels, and slew many Jews. In 168 he attacked Jerusalem, killed many of the people and sold others as slaves. Many fled, the temple worship was forbidden, the victor set up a small altar on top of the temple altar. This defiled the altar. Mattathias, called it the abomination of desolation. Books of the law were burnt, circumcision was forbidden and women were put to death who had their children circumcised. In 167 B. C. the Maccabean revolt began. The father was Mattathias, there were five brothers. In 165 they gained the victory over the Syrian general, Lysias. The next year Antiochus died. The following passages in Daniel are given by Dr. Driver as referring to Antiochus. Other passages may refer to this persecutor. The admission that they do refer, does not carry the conclusion that the book was written by some one of that age. On the contrary it would seem to be natural for Daniel to predict something of so important a siege in the life of the chosen seed. The references are chronologically arranged.

Dan. 8:9, 23. 11:23.

11:22b.

11:22, 24.

11:25, 27.

8:9b to 10 and 11:28.

11:29-30.

8:11f, 13b, 24, 25.

11:30b to 35.

The book of Daniel is called an apocalypse, or apocalyptic. This word, in popular lectures, is usually raised to the fifth power and lost in mystery. It means "Revelation". The first word of the last book of the New Testament is "Apocalypse". It is the *revelation* of Jesus Christ. It is not intended to mystify. The prophet Daniel and the apostle John have peculiarities. They gave rise to many imitators. In the prophecy of Daniel and the revelation given to John, there is no "Thus saith the Lord". In both, symbols are used and numbers abound. Both end their predictions at a coming of Christ. Visions form the substance of their prophecies.

John has a message direct for God's people, in the seven

churches. He was shown things which must shortly come to pass, but "shortly" must mean at least a week in that land where a thousand years are as one day.

Dr. Driver has summed up in a masterful way the reasons for the belief that Daniel was written at some period between 300 and 164 B. C. His reasons are historical, linguistic and theological. He gives the historical argument under eight heads.

(a). In the division of the Old Testament into law, prophets and psalms Daniel was at first assigned under the last class. He was not at first recognized as a prophet. If the book had been written in Babylon, it would have taken its place among the prophetic books.

(b). In the Apocrypha, Jesus, son of Sirach, writing about 200 B. C. omits Daniel in his list of prophets.

(c). In the third year of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar is said to have besieged Jerusalem. The book of Kings is silent, and Jeremiah, (25:1) writes of the fourth year of Jehoiakim being the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign.

(d). The "Chaldeans", in Dan. (1:4, 2:2) are synonymous with the wise men. Prof. Schrader, an archaeologist in Berlin University, says that this sense of the word "Chaldeans" is unknown till after the Babylonian empire had ceased.

(e). Belshazzar is represented as king of Babylon, son of Nebuchadnezzar. In point of fact, Nabonidus was the last king of Babylon. He was a usurper, not related to Nebuchadnezzar and one Belshazzar is mentioned as his son. These facts come from the clay tablets.

Cyrus's general, Gobyras or Ugbaru, entered Babylon without resistance. The king had fled. That was in June. In October Cyrus entered Babylon. Even if the king held the citadel till this time, why did the handwriting on the wall declare that the kingdom was delivered to the Medes and Persians, when they already had possession? How could Belshazzar then give rewards in his kingdom?

(f). Darius, son of Ahashuerus, a Mede, is made king over the realm of the Chaldeans. There seems to be no room for such a ruler. According to all other authorities, Cyrus is the immediate successor of Nabonidus, and the ruler of the entire Persian empire. Darius organizes the empire into one hundred and twenty satrapies. Darius the Mede must be a reflection into

the past of Darius Hystaspis, who was the father—not son—of Ahasheurus (Xerxes). He divided the empire into satrapies. The confusion in dates and persons would be natural to a writer four centuries later.

(g). Dan. 9:2 states that he knew by the books the number of years for which, according to Jeremiah, Jerusalem should be waste. This implies a collection of books which, it may be safely affirmed, was not formed in 536 B. C.

(h). Other considerations: The improbability that Daniel, a strict Jew, should have suffered himself to be initiated into the class of Chaldeans, “wise men”, or should have been admitted by the wise men themselves; Nebuchadnezzar’s seven years of insanity (lycanthropy) with his edict concerning it; the absolute terms with which both he and Darius, while remaining idolaters, recognize the supremacy of the God of Daniel and command homage to be done to him.

Prof. Sayce holds that the author did not intend history, but to construct upon historical basis, though regardless of the facts as they actually occurred, edifying religious narratives. (Haggadah).

Dr. Driver next presents the argument from language.

(a). The number of Persian words is remarkable, at least fifteen. Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles also contain them, but these are after the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. It is surprising that they should be used by Daniel before the conquest.

(b). Greek words; three names of musical instruments. They are written in Hebrew, *kitharos* (a harp), *psalterin* (psaltery), and *sumponyah* (dulcimer). The first may have reached Babylon, for it is a word used by Homer, but the other two are used first by Aristotle and Plato respectively. These words, it may be confidently affirmed, could not have been used in the book of Daniel unless it were written after the dissemination of Greek influences in Asia through the conquests of Alexander.

(c). The Aramaic of Daniel is a western Aramaic dialect spoken about Palestine. Still the argument is not conclusive, for (1) the differences are not considerable, (2) Ezra uses much the same language. (The use of “Chaldee” for Aramaic is a misnomer, and a source of confusion).

(d). The Hebrew represents the later Hebrew, that subsequent to Nehemiah. Dr. Driver gives twenty-five words illustrative of

the difference in language. These are indisputable, and, as the author states, the list could be lengthened.

Dr. Driver thus concludes that portion of his argument: "The verdict of the language of Daniel is thus clear. The Persian words presuppose a period after the Persian empire had been well established; the Greek words demand, the Hebrew supports, and the Aramaic permits a date after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great, B. C. 332."

3. The theology of the book points to a later age than the exile. The doctrines of the Messiah, of angels, of the resurrection and of a judgment on the world are taught with more distinctness and in a more developed form than elsewhere in the Old Testament.

We have presented the arguments of the writer but not the grace in which he sets forth his view. The spirit is admirable; it is of one feeling his way, uncertain of the path. In the Pentateuch he is far more dogmatic. Still he is not ambiguous. He stands with those who bring Daniel down to 300-164 B. C.

Dr. Driver's plan did not include the bringing in of strong objections to his argument. Even where his argument had been completely answered, he preferred to state it in the old form. There is not the advance in that method which the spirit of the age demands. Or it limits the belief of these theories to a small circle who suffer from the aggressive attitude of the more progressive scholars, who hold the defensible traditional view without strain, and are thus free to push investigation.

In surveying these arguments, the conviction grows, that the rule of the new school, of which we have given examples in the Appendix,† to avoid attention to the difficulties urged by the old school is an unfortunate attitude for the new party. A defensive war invites defeat. So in Daniel, the submission of difficulties in connection with an ancient writing amounts to little with those acquainted with the writings of antiquity. They cluster around every ancient tomb. In these arguments the historical objections arise largely from fragmentary knowledge. Neither the deciphered tablets nor the record in the Bible is full.

As an illustration, the Hittites are in court. Skeptic; accused the Bible of error for many decades on the ground that it mag-

†See Note I.

nified a tribe to a nation. Their monuments have shown the correctness of the biblical history. In Daniel nothing has been found which completely clears up every question; but nothing has been unearthed to contradict, and much to confirm.

Are we sure that Daniel was not among the prophets? There are various lists. That of the Massorites was neither ancient nor chronological. In the LXX the order is the law, the earlier prophets, the psalms, the later prophets. In the Peshito the last books are Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel and Daniel. Thus he was among the prophets. Josephus ranks Daniel as a prophet. Melito placed him there. Jesus ranked him as a prophet. Then why did the Massorites count him among the Hagiographa? First, their Jewish prejudice against the argument that Jesus was therein foretold; second, Daniel was a statesman; his message was unlike that of Jeremiah or Isaiah. They had a message to the nation, a summons to duty; but Daniel did not. They had an objective command, he had a subjective vision. They had a rebuke, a warning, an exhortation to the people: Daniel spoke to far distant nations, to men on the other side of the globe, and of the Christ.

The style of an author probably influenced his place. David is called a prophet, yet his words are in the Psalms. Moses was a prophet, but no special book records his prophecies. His psalm is in the psalter. Daniel is the example in the Old Testament of apocalypse. That combines history and prophecy. It has been called the philosophy of history. If so, the generalization is very brief—it is simply that God pulls down and builds up nations. Daniel thus presents the future as rolling out from under the divine hand, while the other prophets had revealed to Israel the truth that their sins had been the source of their national woe.

Daniel is a statesman who receives strange visions and revelations from God. They are not accompanied with the remonstrances, nor the minatory predictions of the prophetic order; from this fact the doubt as to their classification may have arisen.

(b.) The omission of the name of Daniel by the son of Sirach is not more surprising than his omission of Ezra or of Mordecai.

(c.) The Jews and the Babylonians had precisely contradictory customs in estimating a king's reign. The Babylonians did not

count till the beginning of the next year. The Jews antedated his ascension and counted that fraction of a year as an entire year. So in Daniel we may read of a third year per Babylonian calender, and in Jeremiah of the fourth year according to the Jewish method. In Japan all birth days come on the first day of January. The babe is no year old till the first of the ensuing year, then is generously called two years old.

This objection also turns against the side which brings it; for the record being so exactly in harmony with conflicting customs demands a writer who knows. A scribe writing in Palestine, who had never known Babylon would have been caught in some little detail like that. This objection makes a strong request for Daniel's pen.

(d). The Chaldeans as the "wise men". The tablets establish that fact, but not as early as Daniel, so far as deciphered.

It is a metaphor unless we accept the solution given by the LXX, which reads, "the magicians of the Chaldees". If that does not satisfy, then it may still be Daniel and defended by a usage none can deny. John uses the term "the Jews" invariably for that section of the Jews which hated Jesus. So Daniel could have spoken of these men as the most powerful caste among the Chaldees.

(e). Some items in the history are not clear. Daniel does not say that there was fighting when Cyrus entered Babylon. The verse, "that night was Belshazzar slain", is questioned. Or it may be assigned to the next chapter, so as to mean, "in the night Belshazzar was slain".

The tablet of Nabonidus, containing his prayer for his son says: "Belsharusur, my first born the offspring of my heart do thou (the moon god Sin) place the adoration of thy great deity in his heart; may he not give way to sins; may he be satisfied by life's abundance".

This was found by Sir Henry Rawlinson in 1854. Canon Rawlinson claims that the tablets prove that he was co-sovereign with his father, and, by his mother, grandson of Nebuchadnezzar.

In 1880 two tablets of Cyrus were discovered. They mention the son of the king, who was first in the field. The war lasted ten years. Nabonidus was taken prisoner, his son was slain. These tablets do not give the name of the prince, but they endorse Daniel. The queen-mother on the appearance of the hand-

writing on the wall, told her son Belshazzar, of Daniel, and of his grandfather's experience with the prophet. Nabonidus usurped the kingdom. Naturally Daniel retired, or was retired, so that Belshazzar did not know him. Thus Daniel could become the third ruler in the kingdom, because the promiser was second. The reading of one tablet (Hagen's translation) is disputed by one archaeologist of renown; viz., Prof. Sayce. "In the night of the 11th of Marchesvan, Gobryas fell upon the son of the King and killed him." Prof. Sayce, who holds with the traditional school in regard to the Pentateuch, is with the men who bring Daniel to a late date. He reads that "the wife of the king". Not only is he alone, but it is improbable. The act would be doubted, *i. e.* that a general would kill the wife of a defeated foe, or, if so, that it would be recorded.

Cyrus entered Babylon on the 3d of Marchesvan, without fighting. It is possible, it is strongly probable, that Belshazzar held out till the 11th in the citadel. On that night, it being a festival for the moon-god, he desecrated the vessels of the temple and Gobryas took the citadel. Then Belshazzar was slain. Then Gobryas was appointed ruler over Babylon and changed his name to Darius. This last point is not yet certified. It is a hypothesis. Its confirmation by the tablets is about all that is necessary to read Daniel in the contemporaneous history.

This, too, is an objection which by causing research makes the Bible account more certain.

This also answers the next objection (*f*), that there is no room for Darius as a ruler. The orientals to this day change names easily. Daniel does not mention Gobryas. That he was the general of Cyrus is abundantly revealed. That Cyrus would appoint a Mede as a ruler in Babylon while he went to Susa is very probable. Daniel gives the age of Darius—62. This would agree with the position Gobryas held.

(*g*). Daniel understood by the books. Dr. Driver understands these books to be a collection which he affirms was not made by 536 B. C. How does he know? Moses was told to write in a book the curse against Amalek. That that was ancient no one doubts, for Saul exterminated them. From that time on the children of Israel would write. Dr. Driver admits J, E, D and Joshua, Amos, Hosea before the exile and Jeremiah about that time. That would make a collection of books.

As a Hebraist Dr. Driver ought to have known that the term used *sepharim* is used of a letter, and the prophecy of Jeremiah was written as a letter. {2Ki. 19:14, Isa. 37:14, Jer. 29:1-19}.

**Criticism Helps
Daniel.**

A singular fatality attaches to objections brought against Daniel. Like the lions, not only harmless, but promoting him to greater honor. The reader can hardly fail to be struck with the feebleness of the reasoning these noted scholars are obliged to employ.

(h). "The improbability that Daniel would have suffered himself to be initiated into the class of Chaldean 'wise men', or should have been admitted by the wise men themselves". Could he help it?

It is not stated that Daniel was initiated. He was taught the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans. His consent was not asked.

"Nebuchadnezzar's seven years of insanity, with his edict respecting the absolute terms in which both he and Darius . . . recognize the supremacy of the God of Israel, though retaining idolatry."

Still, Dr. Driver does not lay much stress on these objections, saying that our knowledge is hardly such as to give us an objective criterion. The seven years are now supposed to have been seven months. The records of asylums furnish numerous examples where the demented have supposed themselves to be various animals—wolves, lions, cats, or dogs, or glass, butter, or other things equally grotesque.

In China, one man, hearing another's religion, will praise it as greatly superior to his own. He will do so in regard to house, wife, children, and never mean a word of it. These oriental monarchs, in declaring the supremacy of Daniel's God, and commanding him to be worshipped, never intimated that other gods were to be neglected.

A woman in Japan, hearing the children repeating the first of the ten commandments, exclaimed: "I always thought the more gods I could worship the better. I'll sweep them all away." The reasoning of these monarchs was not so deep. They simply added Jehovah to the Pantheon.

The introduction of such weak objections injures a thesis.

They reveal, by their rags, the paucity of resources. A few strong arguments would be more effective.

Diction.

The next list of objections is based on language. Here authorities clash. We shall cite strong men from the radical wing who grant but scant probative force to an argument from language.

Daniel in the court would hear words quite different from that of the common people. In Japan before one is introduced to the emperor he is trained in the court dialect. He may be an educated Japanese and yet be unable to express his thoughts intelligibly to the Throne. For his imperial majesty is hedged in by a wall of language. Some of the court language we have heard. It is composed of different words, and of words used in other senses than the speech of the common people. Therefore Daniel may have employed a language which was infused with words used around the king. These words later were used by the nobility, then by the better class, then by the multitude.

Thompson, in the *Pulpit Commentary*, calls attention to the difference between Spencer and Langford, one being in the court and using words which afterward became a part of common English speech, the other among the people writing at the same time yet employing words which became obsolete. The comparison is a happy one. It nullifies at one stroke the arguments we now proceed to examine.

Dr. Driver, who is justly renowned for his attainments in Hebrew, and his work on "Hebrew Tenses", says that the turning point in Hebrew style falls in the age of Nehemiah. The Hebrew of Daniel is that of the age subsequent to Nehemiah. The *Chronicles*, *Esther* and *Ecclisastes* he classifies as the most degenerate Hebrew, and these Daniel's Hebrew resembles.

B. F. Westcott, yet more generally known through his work on the Greek New Testament, says of Daniel's language: "The character of the Hebrew bears the closest affinity to that of *Ezekiel* and *Habakkuk*—who lived near Daniel's time. The Aramaic, like that of *Ezra*, is of an earlier form than exists in any other Chaldean document."[†]

Bleek said we have not remains of Hebrew literature after the

[†]Smith's Bible Dictionary (Daniel .

captivity to enable us to trace the gradual degeneracy of the language.

Gesenius ascribed to Ezra, Nehemiah, Zachariah and Malachi slightly purer idiom than Daniel's. He asserted that Ezekiel's Hebrew was marked by the most flagrant instances of grammatical irregularities and incorrectness.‡

If other writers lost purity of speech by contact with the Chaldeans, it is not surprising if Daniel should be so influenced. Living in the court where the representatives of all nations were to be found, his language would be marked by the introduction of words from various tongues.

In the Apocrypha the book of Ecclesiasticus was written in Hebrew as early as 280 or 180 B. C. Some portions of the Hebrew have been discovered. The Greek translation was not lost.

Dr. Thomson compares the new words of the Hebrew fragments with the new words of the Hebrew of Daniel. In two verses he finds three words not found in the biblical Hebrew. In two more verses he finds four words unknown to biblical Hebrew. One of these is a connective used five times. These constructions are found in biblical Hebrew but once. Thus, if Ecclesiasticus was written by 280 B. C., Ecclesiastes was written earlier, and Daniel is yet more ancient. He has words or phrases which are found in Ezra or Chronicles or Ezekiel. These were in the exile. So his illustrations turn in favor of the traditional view. Prof. Bevan could find but eight words. Thomson reduces this list to two. These are few in so many chapters.

Dean Farrar, though believing in a late date, **Critics Refuse to Hurt** yields the argument in Hebrew, saying: "Nothing certain can be inferred from the philological examination of the Hebrew. On this part of the subject there has been a great deal of rash, incompetent assertion". Prof. Cheyne in the *Britannica*, says: "From the Hebrew of the book of Daniel no important inference as to date can be drawn".

The words of Persian origin come next to be considered. This list has shrunk in size. Formerly the names given to Daniel and his three companions, and other names, were counted Per-

‡Speaker's Commentary, Daniel, p. 227.

sian. Dr. Driver reduces the number to fifteen. Some of these are found in Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther.

The argument here belongs to the other side, for it is to be expected that Daniel, as a courtier, would meet and use words from different nations.

The Greek words are few. At the beginning of the century they numbered ten. Dr. Driver names three, but yields one without being asked. All three are names of musical instruments. The one which Dr. Driver yields (*kitharos*) was used by Homer, hence may have found its way to Babylon by 550 B. C. Only two words remain which "demand" a later date for Daniel. Is not that too slender a basis for such a large demand? It asks that the book of Daniel be pronounced an imposture. Suppose those two words were written on the margin by some impertinent copyist who wished to show his knowledge of musical instruments. Later copyists, then, would insert them in the text, supposing they had been omitted by mistake.

The *psanterin* (psaltery) affords some evidence of such error. The spelling in the seventh verse is different from that in the fifth, tenth and fifteenth—(*teth* instead of *tau*). Critics suspect a word spelled in different ways of being an interpolation.

The Peshito does not have the word. If it were added by a Greek copyist about 100 B. C., it could find its way into the Masoretic text by 600 A. D., while omitted from the Peshito, which was written outside the sphere of Greek influence.

The testimony against *sumpanyah* is yet stronger. The Masoretic manuscripts clash. The K'thib manuscript has two methods of writing the word, and omits it once. The Q'ri codex also omits it once. In the Greek texts the LXX have the word only twice out of a possible four, and Theodotion has it but once. The Peshito has no instance of *sumponyah*, but has *tziphonia*.

Thus in twenty possible places, if the texts all agreed, only eight have the word, five have a different spelling, and seven omit it altogether. This militates strongly against the assumption that the word was in the original Aramaic of Daniel. Doubts have been raised as to whether *sumponyah* is a transcription of the *sumphonia*. Dr. Driver unconsciously furnishes an argument against the assumption. He says that Polybius first used it as a name of a musical instrument. But he died in 122 B. C. Then if the word was new it would have required some time for it to

reach Babylon. Still it could have been in popular use long before Polybius used it. If Dr. Driver's argument has weight, then it was too late for insertion in a book written 300-164.

Dr. Driver's arguments were all met by Dr. **Facts Are Foes.** Pusey, who preceded Dr. Driver as professor of Hebrew in Oxford. It is marking time to repeat arguments which have been answered. Dr. Driver's assertion that the Greek words could not have been used in the book of Daniel before the conquest by Alexander is point-blank assertion. The Greeks received arts and letters from the East. Those of Asia Minor and the *Ægean* sea were in close communication with Syria, Phœnicia, and Egypt. A Greek is mentioned in the Tel-el Amarna tablets (1450 B. C.).

Sennacherib (704-681 B. C.) equipped a fleet—the only one in Assyrian annals—and manned it with Greeks and Phœnicians. The Greeks were in Nineveh, far to the north of Babylon, in 640 B. C. They had a colony in Egypt in 600 B. C. In Syria and Cyprus they were subject to Assyria and to Egypt. They were more musical than the European Greeks. Theirs was the story of Apollo, and Marsyas, the adoption of the Lydian measure and the improvement of the lyre. The Ionian Greeks formed the best arm of the Egyptian army. When Nebuchadnezzar conquered Egypt he transferred many to Babylon. A Babylonian tablet dated 640 B. C. has two Greek names—witnesses to a tablet.†

There is abundant evidence of the commerce between Babylon and India in 600 to 500 B. C. Indian teak and cedar in Nebuchadnezzar's palace at Borsippa confirm the tablets. Sandal wood, rice and peacocks were imported. Solomon sent ships afar. These facts show that the people of that date were in communication one with another. The assertion that these Greek words could not have reached Babylon until carried on the spears of Alexander shows a marvellous capacity for ignorance of history, or a singular perversity.

Soldiers or traders or wanderers would naturally carry their native musical instruments. These retain their original names. The mandolin with us is a late importation. We call it by the Italian name, though it can be traced back to Greece. If Japan-

†Kennedy: Book of Daniel, pp. 268-9.

ese music should ever be introduced into America (Heaven forbid!) we would speak of the *samisen* and the *koto*. That instruments should rapidly pass over into enterprising Babylon would not be surprising. Yet this is the strongest portion of Dr. Driver's linguistic argument, viz: two words, both names of musical instruments.

It is not probable that the first occurrence of the name in Polybius was soon after its invention. Mommsen has called attention to the fact that the stepping stones which were in every Italian town are mentioned but once by Latin authors. Bartlett has pointed out that family prayer—a universal custom in New England, in Colonial days—was not mentioned by the historians, except an incidental notice in a letter. While the noun *sumphonia* is late in Greek literature, the adjective is early. Homer used it with the corresponding verb. These mean "harmonious" and "to harmonize". In Daniel there is strong reason to believe that it was not intended to signify an instrument, but "harmony". It is artistic fitness that this should be the translation, for it comes at the end of a list of instruments and just such a meaning is needed there—"the sound of the cornet . . . the psaltery a harmony, all kinds of music". This takes away all reason for saying that any words in Daniel demand a late date.

The theological argument has the merit of singularity. It holds that the revelation of the Messiah, of angels, and of the last judgment could not take place so early as Daniel, but could a few hundred years later. The only basis of this argument is in the skepticism which denies revelation. The underlying assumption is that Israel thought out all that we read, and that these revelations were gradually evolved from human wisdom. For this reason a Christian theologian has no right to use this argument. He admits the divine help, and that is not limited to times.

Closely connected is the objection which the theory does not consider, that is, the improbability of a revelation being made to a man whose work is untruthful. The work impresses itself as a sincere production, a supposition which falls to the ground if the work was born centuries after Daniel. This theological argument really sustains the traditional view.

Dr. Driver thinks that Daniel had no interest in the return of his nation from the exile. Yet the ninth chapter is taken up

with Daniel's prayer for his people. He understood from Jeremiah's prophecy that the time was nearly completed, so the surmise of the professor, that Daniel had no hope of their return, is contradicted by the prophet's action.

Again Dr. Driver says that it is consonant with God's method to raise up teachers at the time when the need arises. This likewise turns out a foe to Dr. Driver's theory. The supreme need was in Babylon; for the prophets of Baal would say that Josiah's reforms caused the captivity. Baal (Bel) was victorious in the tug of war. Though Jehovah's prophets did affirm that it was Manasseh's sin which the Lord would not pardon; though they affirmed that Israel brought it upon themselves by idolatry there were false prophets taking the other side. Babylon was the forum for the final argument. Jewish faith never wavered after that ordeal. Nothing could compare with the exquisite adaptation of the miracles recorded in Daniel to the requirements of the problem. Just as the miracles against Pharaoh demonstrated the superiority of Jehovah over the gods of the Egyptians, so on a higher plane, the miracles of the exile, burned into the Jew the monotheism which he has never lost.

Close to Dr. Driver's theory stand objections to which he is blind. Admitting that God rears teachers at the time needed would he ever raise up a deceiver? If God had wished to encourage the Maccabees, by raising up a prophet, his arm was not shortened. None of the Maccabees knew anything of this supposed writer of that day, they denied the existence of a prophet. He would have been stronger in his own character, with God's authority than in Daniel's armor. Then how could a false prophet give true prophecies. "He may have had some historical documents." That is piling one assumption on top of another. That does not explain the visions. If they were seen by Daniel and written, then the easiest and most sensible conclusion is that Daniel wrote the book. If Daniel did not see them how reconcile true prophecies with a character so reckless as to truth. Such alleged inspiration of an untruthful man is repugnant to the conception of a holy and truth-loving God.

The history of criticism on Daniel contains
Weak Criticism. nothing to encourage its aims, or hope of their success.

Porphyry (233-302 A. D.) sounded the keynote.

In the twelfth volume of his ponderous work against Christianity he denied to Daniel prophetic rank. He claimed that the book was written in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. All his known arguments were met by Jerome, and fifteen centuries rested on that refutation. All his arguments with which we are acquainted have been reproduced in this century.

Bertholdt sounded the trumpet in 1803. He copied from Spinoza, Hobbes, Acosta and Semler, all unbelievers. Bertholdt saw nine writers in Daniel, Michaelis found eight, while Eichhorn made ten. De Wette and Kiel buried all but one. De Wette, Gesenius, Ewald, Hitzig, Bunsen, Bleek, Graf, Schrader, and Gratz are among the able scholars who endorse Porphyry's view.

The position taken by Dean Farrar, who in literature is a dean-in-particular,[†] is a representative of those who hold Daniel to be a religious novel. A work of fiction intended to teach and to do good, is conceivable. Tobit is one. Indeed the Apocrypha is full of them. This theory does not explain how Daniel was kept from the superstitious practices which made the stock-in-trade of the wise men, and which disfigure and condemn Tobit. Daniel did not perform incantations with a liver of a fish, nor mix his geography badly, as did Tobit. Moreover he uttered prophecies which men of faith accept as genuine.

In this theory Nebuchadnezzar represents Antiochus. Awkwardly enough Darius also represents him, so does Belshazzar. Unfortunately, while these jostle each other, none nor all truly represent Antiochus. Neither in deeds nor in character, is there sufficient analogy to justify the decision, while the contrast between Antiochus and the others utterly forbids such conclusion.

This view has not only all the difficulties of the other unbiblical theory, but has special troubles of its own. The absence of Daniel when his three friends were cast into the furnace of fire, would never do in a religious novel. No word is given to explain his absence. Then the ideal Jew would do something for the return. Excepting the prayer, Daniel is left without any glory in that line.

THE POSITIVE ARGUMENTS.

Is not nearly all the Porphyryan argument negative? Do not

[†]A dean-in-particular is one not subject to ordinary diocesan rule.

these alert scholars stop at the word "point"? The traditionalist has the plain quotation, "As for me, Daniel, my spirit was grieved", and similar sayings. The assailants have to be content with "the indications point" to an unknown writer of 300-164 B. C. Are not "the indications" merely objections? Nothing is free from such criticism. Objections can be filed against any system, any life, any character, any affirmation. Men have objected to the family, to the church, to the Christ, to God. This does not necessarily form an argument.

Daniel was a youth at the beginning of the story. He was nearing ninety at its close. The book is no effort to record a history of those times.

Innumerable insects gather around a tropical light-house, and may obscure its rays, but within it shines as brightly as ever. So it is unhappy logic which sums up difficulties in Daniel or in Moses and concludes that its assumptions are proved. The objections must rise to impossibility, or to strong improbability, before they really possess probative force.

Dr. Driver had one which he said demanded a late date. If it could be maintained it would have affirmative force. It is that of the two Greek words. But these survivals out of many formerly urged also turn pale on investigation. If they resolutely stood in the text, if they could not have been used before 164 B. C., they would be valid.

**Objections Are
Cheap.**

Filing objection is simply fault-finding. It is valuable only when vigorous, decisive, and attacking vital points. It is useless when vacillating, inconclusive, and skirmishing far from

the citadel..

The positive arguments of the old school are as follows:

1. The right of possession. This is nine points out of ten. The burden of proof lies with the one who would throw Daniel to the lions.

No one has been bold enough to say that Daniel could not have written the book.

2. The book itself. Read it and mark the passages which suggest:

That Daniel did not write it.

That Onias IV did. (Farrar's guess).

That it was occasioned by the persecution of Antiochus.

The belief that Antiochus is symbolized is general, but not universal. That is a question of interpretation. It is not directly concerned with the question of Danielic authorship.

The sincerity of the writer, the modest, yet unequivocal affirmation: "As for me, Daniel", his humility and moral earnestness, carefully and constantly giving praise to God for all his knowledge, the deep religious spirit, the self abnegation which confesses the sickness caused by therevelation, and the dullness, we might almost say, in not understanding the visions, these are the solid characteristics of a genuine man, not, as Porphyry claimed, an impostor.

Precision.

3. The history. This is a longer argument than can be here fully stated. The lycanthropy of Nebuchadnezzar has been sneered at by others than Wellhausen. Dr. Driver doubts it though not boldly. It turns out in favor of the truthfulness of the history because it could hardly have been invented. The first record aside from this account, is found in the fourth century of the Christian era. To-day the medical annals are full of instances of persons who imagined themselves to be wolves, lions, roosters or candidates for congress and acted accordingly.

The originality of the conception takes it from a forger. An imposter would make his writing resemble that of others. The lycanthropy being the first in all literature that has come to us, it stands in the unaffected simplicity and confidence of truth, without apology for being unusual.

The Hand, writing on the wall is another of the same class. It had no precedent, it has had many imitators. It would require a genius to invent so powerful a stroke of dramatic interest. It would not have been impossible to a man of great talent, but such a man would hardly have been content to lean on Daniel, who was almost unknown if this book be not from his pen.

The Prince.

The British Museum has about one thousand tablets belonging to the reign of Nabonidus. Of those deciphered, a number name Belshazzar. Two are on business. Once his secretary rents a house for sixty-eight dollars. The renter agrees not to sub-let, to keep it in repair, and to take care of the trees. In another Belshazzar's steward sells the wool crop for the prince. He takes a mortgage

on a house till the price is paid. The names of six witnesses are attached. It is dated the 20th day of Adar in the eleventh year of Nabonidus.

These conclusively prove Belshazzar to have been the son of the king. There is no improbability in Daniel's history, it would have been impossible for the story to have been kept accurately for four hundred years, passing from mouth to mouth.

4. The Theology. The leading of God was to make Israel the teacher of all nations. Salvation is of the Jews. One truth at a time. The vital issue was against idolatry. In Babylon the true God was with the oppressed. In revealing secrets, in unrolling the map of the future, in protecting his servants, in punishing kings his attributes were revealed as never before. These are recorded in Daniel. The 2d Isaiah continues that strain. He scoffs at the idols, he taunts the wise men, he sentences Babylon and he calls Cyrus by name.

Punishment sometimes hardens. Often had Israel been afflicted before, but never with permanent effect, till they were in the furnace of Babylon. The contest of Jehovah with the power which had subdued the known world was the turning point. Nothing can account for that change if Daniel be a late production. The nations of that day, and for a long day afterward, believed that the gods contested among themselves, and the most powerful gained victories for his chosen people. That argument held in Israel. It happens to contain truth. Why, then, should Israel, when a captive people, turn to their tutelary god who had been apparently overcome? Without the miracles, the visions, the revelations of Daniel, a philosophic answer is impossible. This explains the greater distinctness and fullness of the revelations at that time. He who can believe that a framer of a fictitious story could write in so strong a vein of the Messiah, of angels, of the resurrection, of the judgment on the world, would never be condemned for lack of faith.

"The Messiah" emerges in Daniel. The word **Messiah a Sufferer** means "anointed" but Daniel gives us the **Not a Welcome Idea**. finite article. This is accepted by the writers of the New Testament. Another water mark. In two aspects the Messiah appears in Daniel. He is a king but he is a sacrifice. The Jew had no apperception for that thought. A suffering Messiah was an idea which had to be pressed upon

the Jews again and again. Even the crucifixion did not open their eyes. This being true, an uninspired Jew of the third century B. C. would never have made the Messiah a sufferer. If inspired, we once more meet that mountain which lies across the path of every scheme which denies the validity of the Bible history, viz. God would not inspire a man to lie. Dr. Driver says the Book of Daniel contains true prophecies. Elder Peter affirms: "No prophecy ever came by the will of man, but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit". Dr. Driver is orthodox.

5. Numbers. The seventy weeks of chapter 9:24 contain an argument which many consider decisive. The seventy weeks could find fulfillment only in Christ. "To finish the transgression, to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity" was the burden upon his shoulders alone. "From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to rebuild Jerusalem to Messiah the Prince". Seventy weeks are named in verse 24, sixty-nine in verse 25. Following Numbers and Ezekiel, a day is taken to represent a year. This gives 490 or 483 years. Counting from the time the new critics place the book, the 490 years would end in 190 to 336 A. D. Estimating from the decree of Cyrus, would bring the termination at 48 A. D. But that would be fifteen years after the death of the Messiah. Ezra received a commission from Artaxerxes which not only authorized him to build the Temple, but to restore the city. This is the more probable date. That is, 457 B. C. to which the years of the earthly life of the Messiah are to be added. Adding thirty-three to 457 brings the exact number, viz: 490. Thirteen years after Ezra, Nehemiah was appointed governor and authorized to rebuild the walls. An accurate calculation, based on lunar years of 354 days, is said to bring the end of the 490 years exactly on that day of Pentecost, when the apostle Peter proclaimed the coronation of Jesus as Lord and Christ.

The statement of Dr. Driver that "The interest of the book manifestly culminates in the relations existing between the Jews and Antiochus" (Int., p. 509) expresses the view of one school which would be rejected by others as a narrow and inadequate generalization. To them the world empires, and the Messiah would be of far more interest as the central theme of the book of Daniel. Some have denied any allusion to Antiochus. Admit

ting that is also extreme, it is enough to show that the interest of the book does not manifestly culminate where Dr. Driver places it. If the seventy weeks are counted back from the time of Antiochus, the beginning would be in Manasseh's day, which was before Jerusalem was destroyed.

No time suits except that of the old Christian interpretation. Even there our data are not full enough for dogmatism. However, the closeness is such as to preclude the idea that this was spoken in 300-164 B. C. To say that the prophecy was handed down by tradition is a draft on credulity which no student of history can honor. Let a report pass from one mouth to another then to a third and a fourth and it will be innocently changed. Pass it across a state, or a month and it will be scarcely recognizable. How much more would a tradition be changed in filtering through centuries, and from the court to the common people, and from Babylon to Judea. The prophecy is very exact, it is with some difficulty committed to memory. He who can believe that it was given to Daniel and by him handed down to others and not penned till the late date assigned believes on subjective evidence.

But if spoken by the Omniscient to Daniel and by him faithfully recorded, then the entire book is consistent, both with itself and with the revelation God was giving to man.

"Perhaps written materials were at the disposition of the author". This lacks something of scholarship. It is pure conjecture, to escape the force of argument. To be exact, Dr. Driver should have indicated what portions were the written documents, what sections added, and have given some reason for such belief. To make such a guess is far from the precision and perfect nicety of work which should characterize the fearless and competent scholar.

6. Dr. Driver does not touch the ethical problem. He does not see it. Yet, is not his admission that the book contains predictions, numerous and minute, fatal to his theory? For the ascription of a written document to another who never wrote it is a forgery the world over. If Daniel wrote them and the historical background in which they are immovably set, then Dr. Driver is logically with the other side. If Daniel did not write them, then there is the ethical objection to his position. It is a matter of deep regret that this problem has not received proper atten-

tion from those who yield such easy and prompt assent to whatever is certified to be new.

To affirm that the Holy Spirit filled an unprincipled forger with the knowledge of these wondrous revelations is to contravene the drift of all of God's dealings with men. He could overrule a Balaam or a Caiaphas, but to give such revelations to a man deceiving the elect by a fictitious writing is unprecedented.

To say that an upright man wrote a book for Daniel, when Daniel had not requested it, nor any one else, and put in predictions as though Daniel had written them, is too great an assumption.

7. The LXX makes no difference between the new name of Daniel, Belteshazzar, and that of Belshazzar the prince. If the book was written late, it would have been in the time of the translation of the LXX. Such a mistake at that time would have been improbable, while if it was written by Daniel the mistake was easily made.

8. The external evidence is forceful. *what date* Ezekiel **Other Jews Aid.** names Daniel twice. Once the Lord uses him together with Noah and Job as models of righteousness. Again his wisdom is made a standard of the highest type. The revelation of the king's dream was doubtless heralded far and wide as a greater victory than any on the tented field.

Nehemiah has a prayer which closely resembles that of Daniel for the release of the captives (Neh. 1:7, Dan. 9:7).

Zechariah had visions like unto Daniel's, horns and all.

what date The most startling testimony comes from the mighty leader of the Maccabees. If this remarkably unique book of Daniel had been written in his day, or just preceding, he would have known it. The first book of Maccabees is trustworthy history. It begins with the times of Alexander the Great. "He went through to the ends of the earth." His successors "put crowns on their heads and evils were multiplied". He calls Antiochus, "a wicked root". "The abomination of desolation" is used by the writer of this book. That surely came from Daniel. It is found there and nowhere else. In that book it is emphatic (9:27, 11:31, 12:11). Under similar circumstances that expression became applicable in New Testament days. Men do not canonize their contemporaries. That quotation is from a revered source; then the book

of Daniel must have been known to the Maccabees. It is the work of a prophet. So the Jews decided, and so Jesus said. But there was no prophet in the days of the Maccabees. *what date*

Mattathias, the father of the Maccabees, in this **No Prophet in 164 B. C.** work exhorts them to resist Antiochus. In his long list of national heroes he names the three who "by believing were saved out of the flames, Daniel for his innocency was delivered from the mouth of lions".

How did he obtain his data if Daniel were not a recognized work in his day? The five sons did not call their father, sturdy patriot as he was, a prophet. After the victory they pulled down the altar which had been profaned by Antiochus, and laid the stones away "until there should come a prophet to show what should be done with them". *21 = 216*

On the death of Judas, one of the brothers, "there was great affliction in Israel, the like whereof was not since the time that a prophet was seen among them". This asserts a long interval since there had been a prophet. If the man who wrote Daniel were there, he would have been recognized as a prophet. But they chose Simon to succeed Judas, "until there should arise a faithful prophet". The book of Maccabees is at the latest time assigned to the writing of Daniel. The jealousy with which the Jew guarded his sacred books is shown by the custom of counting the letters in a copy to see if it were exactly in agreement with the book copied from. The fact that they reject books which the Roman and Greek churches admit into the canon is evidence that Daniel could not have been written near that time. No such author is mentioned. It is expressly stated that they had not seen a prophet for a long period. The inevitable conclusion is that no prophet was near that date. But Daniel is among the prophets, and rightly there.

Second Esdras is another apocryphal work which names Daniel "this is the interpretation thereof, The eagle which thou sawest come up from the sea is the kingdom which was seen in vision of thy brother Daniel."

Malachi was a prophet writing about 440 B. C. *440 BC*
Malachi on Daniel's The date is not controverted to any extent.

Side.

He foretold the coming of Elijah to prepare the way, and the coming of the Lord to his temple. He leaves no room for another prophet. "Behold I send you

Elijah before the great and notable day of the Lord." Elijah was to come next. Nearly 300 years later the Maccabees mourn the cessation of the prophetic voice. No one says that after the Maccabees came the writer of Daniel. Is not this decisive testimony that Daniel was before Malachi, book and all? To imagine the book written at a late date by some one who was not a prophet is the gasp of a theory which refuses to be comforted, or to be convinced.

"Remember ye the law of Moses which I commanded him in Horeb, for all Israel, even statutes and judgments", charged Malachi. It sounds like the last words of a revelation closed until a brighter sun shall arise. Elijah was the next one due. He came in the person of John the Harbinger. Another prophet between Malachi and John is a violent intrusion. To some minds deeply susceptible to scriptural truth this will be conclusive.

9. Josephus testifies to two items. First, Alexander's visit to Jerusalem. As he drew near the city a procession of priests in their robes, headed by the high priest arrayed in the habiliments of his office, met the great captain. He was impressed by the procession and declared that he had seen it in a dream. The high priest showed him the prophecy of Daniel, and he was pleased to know that he was the rough he-goat. The Jews asked concessions in regard to the sabbath and sabbatic year, which Alexander granted. He entered the city and offered sacrifice under the direction of the high priest. While Josephus is not infallible, there is nothing improbable in his recital. Only, Daniel could not have been shown if written at the date assigned by the new critics. For Alexander died at 323 B. C. That he granted concessions to the Jews is admitted.

Josephus says that which indirectly puts Daniel back to the place where he naturally falls. The late date was not broached in Josephus's time. He says that no books were admitted into the canon which were not written by prophets and before the death of Artaxerxes Longimanus. That shuts the canon as

in a vise by 425 B. C. This precisely agrees with Malachi in 440 B. C.

10. Gabriel is the next witness. In summon-
Gabriel for Daniel. ing an angel to testify for Daniel and the tra-
 ditional view, the conservative shows enter-
 prise that is commendable. As Gabriel is popularly supposed to
 be the musician who shall sound the trump at the resurrection,
 it will naturally be expected that his testimony will be loud and
 clear. In Luke we learn that he is an angel who stands in the
 presence of God, who was sent to announce the birth of John and
 six months later that of Jesus. To Daniel he also revealed the
 birth of the Messiah. He explained to Daniel another vision,
 but the argument rests on this announcement concerning the
 Anointed. In both testaments he was sent from the Throne.
 To Daniel he named the seventy weeks; to Zacharias the birth
 of the forerunner; to Mary, the Hope of Israel. Could a forger
 of a religious novel or of a fictitious story invent such a char-
 acter? Could he fall upon the very name of the angel whom God
 sent to reveal his gracious purposes toward Elizabeth and Mary?
 Would there be a divine voice revealing the name of that angel
 to a writer of an untruthful document? Thus in closing we are
 brought face to face with that towering ethical problem which,
 like a huge mountain, blocks the advance of a nescient and pole-
 mic theory to acceptance by the normal mind.

"Nescient", for it does not know who wrote these books. It comes out more dazed than it goes in to the inquiry. "Polemic," for it combats the simple, consistent, frank account which the Bible gives of the origin of its separate documents, and attempts to destroy faith in the reliability of the records.

Whether in the sublime poetry of the opening anthem of creation, or the graphic and startling record of the deluge, or the terrifying peals of Sinai, or the sweet, spiritual truths of Deuteronomy, or the shuddering curses or the lofty song of the great lawgiver, or the world-and-time-embracing visions of Daniel, the ethical sense is shocked with the suggestion that some books of the Bible came from men who can not be successfully defended from the charge of forgery.

This school of higher criticism is not high enough to fairly comprehend the magnitude of the issues. It is not deep enough to survey the foundations of the Old Testament books. This de-

Profile

Shook
that
Bible
not of
God -
fully
man -
made

velopment theory can subsist without God, or revelation, or inspiration, or salvation for lost man. It had no vital bond with the higher criticism. That science existed long before this theory was born; it lives on after it is discarded. No friend of humanity need mourn over the demise. Its ethical standard was dangerously low, in the realm of reason, like Prince Rupert's drops, it shivered to atoms as soon as it encountered logic.

A true, scholarly, scientific, higher criticism is **A Scholarly Criticism** in the world. It possesses historic insight. It **Will Live.** is thorough and modern in its methods, scientific in all its investigations, perfectly submissive to the imperial reign of facts, logically loyal to the law of reason and will be supreme in the realm of thought. Such a higher criticism has the strength to see that to hold to the old view when it is assailed, sneered at as foggyish and effete, requires as much wisdom and power as it does to rush after every theory which claims to be new, and to have a patent right on scholarship. In the case of a young man face to face with a teacher who is bewildered by fancies which have formed a trust on learning, it demands more solidity to resist than to yield. It takes a live fish to swim up stream. There is as much temptation to be an iconoclast as to be a martyr. Indeed the psychological lines are parallel. Such a criticism will avoid the eisegesis, the vivisection, the absurdities, the awkward positions which demand more credulity than miracles ever did, which mar this theory and deprive it of standing with the majority of the scholars of the Anglo-Saxon world.

The next chapter is gratuitous. The reader is not obliged to plod through it. A proper respect for the excellent men and fine scholars who have given adhesion to the new view prompts some final words. We have enjoyed writing, or, as the reader will notice, compiling them. We are happy to find so many of the most sagacious of the new school in harmony with us, in these joyous obsequies.

CHAPTER XV.

THE OBITUARY.

Germany is prolific in theories. Baron de Bunsen classed Germany as a thought nation, England as a deed nation. Prof. James of Harvard says the German cannot be bored. He quotes investigations in nerve and thought movements where the patient German made 18000 to 24000 experiments. The newspapers are just recording the discovery for which they suppose the weary world has waited, that a wink requires four-tenths of a second. But Exner found twenty-five years ago that the German wink took only 0.2168 seconds. With an electric shock to the cornea the time was reduced to 0.0578. The Germans call a tramp a *chausptergrabentapezierer*. We don't care. The German has the patience and it serves that kind of a fellow about right. By the time he has introduced himself, and the servant has reported to the drawing room and received orders, it is late in the afternoon. He misses two meals.

A plodding German scholar, J. J. Stahelin, spent thirteen years in the attempt to separate the words used by J, E, and P. Fruitless labor. Dr. Driver makes no list of J or E words, and jams them together in 320 verses, calling them JE.

Beecher was introduced to a Liverpool audience by a prosy speaker. The orator arose and said: "In our country, if we do not strike oil in the first half hour, we stop boring." The audience shouted their appreciation. After sixty years of sterile toil the American would stop boring, but the German is still working away on a barren field. He sees theories die without emotion. He can form others equally good and equally mortal.

**Victory of Higher
Criticism.**

This obituary of the Grafian theory is not the death of the higher criticism. It is its triumph. It has put the darling to sleep, along with many brothers who affirmed that Moses did not write the Pentateuch. The higher criticism expects other theories to spring up in the room of the departed. They always have. President McCosh said: "We borrow our heresies from Germany."

This theory was an injury to higher criticism. It had no necessary connection with that study. Indeed it was a subtle enemy of true higher criticism, with its unscholarly methods and illogical processes. It never tried to stand alone. No presentation can be found which does not come with truth. It started with some indubitable propositions woven in its assumptions, and styled "higher criticism".

The same facts when advanced by Voltaire were met by the witty reply of the Jews, and the seamy side was promptly seen. His boast that scholarship was with him has been the weak element in all succeeding attempts to turn Moses out and the skeptic in.

I--IS THE THEORY REALLY DEAD?

If it can be shown that it had but one thread to hold it to life, and that slender fibre is, by the attending doctors, pronounced broken, will it not be time for the funeral?

If the latest writers on that side admit that no such individuals as J, E, D, P, H, etc., ever lived, shall not the undertaker be ushered in? If the mathematical demonstration reveals that not more than 1 per cent. of the scholars of the world have ever signified their adhesion to the theory, shall not the obsequies proceed?

If it can be fairly proved that after the theory has been before the world sixty-six years, known to America for forty, not one-half of one per cent of American Bible scholars receive it, is not the conclusion legitimate that this intelligent nation has heard, examined and definitely rejected the theory, and we may listen to the wail of the chief mourners?

"The real enemies and ultimate levelers of this so-called Higher Criticism are they of its own household"—*Bishop Ellicott*.

If this theory had come early in the century, it would have been laid out long ago. The theory of Eichhorn was more for-

midable dialectically. It had facts, was more biblical, and was not so naturally illogical. It was not bitterly determined that Moses should not have a line of the Pentateuch.

Moses's law prescribed that the man who studied to produce an evil upon another should suffer that evil himself. Proving the Pentateuch mortal, is hard on the constitution. The critics prove Moses to be a cipher; Moses demonstrates that the critic is writing nonsense. He does it in every generation, and his natural strength is not abated. Other theories equally confident of their mortgage on scholarship will measure strength with the old man of Nebo. Bunyan informs us that "Mr. Wrong-Thoughts-About-Christ died of lingering consumption". Trying to convince the world that the modern knows more about the constitution of the Old Testament than did the Reader of Nazareth, is to mount an automobile for the land where the resident is soon and cheerfully forgotten by the world, while the views which the Bible teacher of Emmaus held are never abraded by time or by adverse criticism.

Proceeding with this cheerful inquest, it will
Cause of Death. be admitted that death follows separation. The flower cut from the stem perishes; the fish taken out of the water dies; the bird denied air is soon deprived of life. Man's spirit separated from his God, is dead.

(a). The theory was divorced from fact. As-
Lack of Facts. true called his book "Conjectures". The various hypotheses which flitted across the stage, never crystallized into any thing less jelly-like. The first argument stated by Dr. Driver is: "the same event is doubly recorded". That is an assertion. It is not a fact and can find none to sustain it. The first of Dr. Briggs: "If it was the same book as the Deuteronomic", etc. An 'if' is not a fact. Our assertion is not, that there are no facts used by the theory. It is that no historic fact has any acquaintance with the theory. In truth the history is so antipodal to the theory that it is the constant endeavor of the critic to reduce the facts to myth and legend. Prof. Cheyne slaps thirty-four centuries in the face saying: "Persons lacking in literary sense take the early books of the Old Testament as statements of fact."[†]

[†]Hallowing of Criticism, p. 30.

Not lacking in literary sense was George Bancroft. He said: "If we do not accept a historian, good reasons based on external evidence should be assigned. It is pedantic folly to base it on tradition. . . . How can a historical method be conceivable, if history be omitted or changed to suit, or the silence made to contradict its voice when it does speak".†

(b). Then the theory was a stranger to system or to scholarly methods. Deduction was impossible. Prophecy inheres to a true science. The traditional view can prophesy the selection of Elohim or of Jehovah as determined by the persons or circumstances with tolerable accuracy. It could not be positive in places where either the Creator or the Redeemer would be appropriate. In an unscholarly theory E uses "Jehovah" 163 times and appears as the writer of a chapter where Elohim is not found and "Jehovah" rules.

After saying "Moses did not write a line of the Pentateuch", there is scarcely a sentence the critic can affirm which will not be denied by some other critic. If he say, "there are four documents", we hear Dr. Briggs (beginning with Gen. 1 as P), "it is necessary to distinguish between P1 and P2", etc. So there are four or five of P documents.

When the critic corrects his remark by saying "five", it can be shown that no smart critic is satisfied with less than seven. If he admits seven, nine can be laid before him; if he confesses there are eleven, thirteen will be produced, and so on, till he is weary, and yet there will be left seven baskets of fragments of the documents predicated to exist in the Pentateuch.

(c). The theory was separated from air. This proposition will be stubbornly resisted. Some will contend that that was all there was of it; others will claim that the analysis reveals other gases. The proposition takes refuge in inspiration. Certainly in digging out the facts as Voltaire did, in putting them together as Reuss, or in polishing and compacting as Kuenen and Wellhausen, or in the talented advocacy of Graf, there was no inspiration, for these men were all unbelievers. Dr. Briggs denies inspiration for the original writers, and if the first two chapters of Genesis are two discrepant accounts of the same event put together by an editor, there will be no hesitation in denying inspiration to such a dunce as that. There is a unanim-

†Miscellanies, p. 322.

ity in the admission by the new school that the writers of the Pentateuch said more than their prayers. The Lord does not inspire the mendacious to write holy books.

(d). The theory was in collision with faith. In politics men often hold one theory in the western and another idea in the eastern hemisphere of the brain. A theologian may be equally agile. Faith comes by hearing the word of God. But the Word never recognizes J, E, D, etc., and never speaks of the new theory but to condemn. To the vast majority of thinking men faith in the Word and acceptance of the Grafian theory were hopelessly incompatible.

(e). Then it had long ago bidden good-by to reason.

This closes its tired eyes. Abandoning the inductive method it proclaimed its incompetency to reason scientifically, which made it a bankrupt at the bar of reason. Never could it reach the goal of truth.

Only one little thread of life is left. In other words, the hypothesis has but one positive argument. (The other argument, that from history, is negative. It argues from silence or irregularity. It is marvellously expanded and correspondingly thin).

Only Two Arguments.

On one positive argument the entire theory hangs. That is from language. Hear Dr. Briggs:† "The evidences for the analysis into four narratives are: (1) Differences in use of words and phrases; (2) differences in style and methods of composition; (3) differences in point of view and representation of religious institutions, doctrines and morals."

This is oracular. All the evidences the learned doctor gives are resolvable into the argument from language and style. His (1) and (2) have the same meaning, with merely a change in the method of expressing the thought. His (3) is biblical theology which changes with the analysis so rapidly that hitherto it has been useless. (See Note F.) That biblical theology depends entirely on the divisions made on the basis of language and style.

The next step is to summon the doctors and listen to their testimony. The design is to prove that there is no evidence in the argument from language that the theory has any connection

†Messianic Prophecy, p. 68

with truth. If not, it has none with life, for this is the only affirmative argument.

The Autopsy. Who killed the theory? Dr. Driver boldly says that Dr. Giesebrecht caused dissolution. "He overshoots the mark and detects many Aramaisms and other signs of lateness in P which do not exist." A brave and true word.

Dr. MacDill (who has no business here, as it is not his funeral) points with his scalpel to the fact that Dr. Driver, professing to give examples of the difference in diction and style, has no words peculiar to J, E, D, H, R or for any of the numerous 2, 3, 4's of the theory, but for P only. MacDill picks these to pieces, with the calm remark that Byron can be shown not to have written *Childe Harold* by the same unscholarly method. Such criticism would leave no room for wise remarks on the cause of the demise, and Dr. MacDill has been put out (shouting as he goes, "Read note D") by the real friends of the departed.

Dr. W. R. Smith makes it dropsical: "In the great mass of Hebrew literature there are no sure linguistic landmarks denoting definite literary periods. What used to be regarded as the earliest of the large components of the Pentateuch is now by the prevailing school made the latest, and the linguistic features have not been considered a bar to either view."[†]

This is the water hydra. Turn it inside out, or stand it on its head, it thrives equally well. As water adapts itself to the shore, so the theory is naturalistic in Germany, rationalistic in England, and evangelistic in America.□

Wise Doctors. De Wette appears to have held that it was as unstable as water. He said that he would not attempt to separate the documents by a purely literary process. Dr. Ewald shared his opinion that it was of little value. Dr. Wellhausen sneered at such efforts, "the firemen kept away from the spot where the conflagration raged". He says boldly that it was grounds of a personal nature which convinced him. This is Dr. Driver's position. In declining to be held to the inductive method, whose imperative and solitary dominion over true investigation he freely concedes, he says that his assumptions (which are the whole thing) are made upon

[†]O. T. in the Jewish Church, p. 281.

grounds which satisfy the author. Those assumptions, when subjected to the laboratory test, fail to yield a residuum of solid fact. Dr. Cheyne makes it out a case of mal-nutrition: "Linguistic arguments do not furnish a positive or conclusive argument".

Dr. Kuenen also states it as a case of starvation: "The extant Israelitish literature is too limited in extent to enable us to determine the age of any work with certainty from mere considerations of language and style" (Hex. p. 268).

It is appropriate that Chicago should here pronounce the benediction. For the theory never stood transportation well. It was rampant in Germany, dominant in Holland, defiant in England, defendant in New York, dependent in Chicago, peccant west of the Mississippi and altogether dormant before it reached the Rockies.

Farther west than Chicago it has not the strength to gasp out a benediction. "Language is now regarded by critics as of least value compared with other arguments.†

Where are the other arguments? Dr. Briggs in summing up finds nothing but language. If they existed he would have put them in the list. This divorces the theory from all that could confer life in the world of letters or in the domain of truth.

Next we will have the doctors as magicians.

The Magic Wand. They will wave the magic wand of scholarship over the ubiquitous J, E, D, P, H, etc., and their individual existence will cease. In other words they never lived. Already the description of the literary styles of each one, so carefully wrought out by Dr. Driver, which we examined at the beginning, has grown antique and amusing.

Dr. Kuenen gives the first blast to lift J, E, P, D into cloud land. After saying that the Hexateuch was handled with freedom, and amended up to the 3d century B. C. he continues "Now this is perfectly natural if, but only if, we think of the redaction of the Hexateuch not as an affair that was accomplished once for all, but as a labor that was only provisionally closed at first, and was long subsequently continued and rounded off. . . . The redaction of the Hexateuch, then, assumes the form of a continous diaskeue or diorthosis, and the redactor be-

†Pres Harper: *Hebraica*, Vol. 5, p. 21.

comes a *collective body* headed by the scribe who united the two works above spoken of into a single whole, but also including the *whole series* of his more or less independent followers.”‡

Instead of being individuals who can be designated, the writers of the Hexateuch are a continuous body of scribes.

Dr. Wellhausen states the same view: “For the most part we have the product of a countless number of narrators, unconsciously modifying each other’s work”.§

Dr. Driver contributes his mite. Doubting the possibility of separating such strong letters as J and E, which he frequently jumbles together he says it is probable that “two writers would make use of the same expressions, such as might be used by any writer of the best historiographical style.”¶

Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt of Cornell in a review of Dr. Kuenen’s Hexateuch, after the customary whistle in the dark that the views of Kuenen are “held by practically all competent and independent investigators”, adds “It is not impossible that we shall also be forced to look upon P less as the siglum of an independent writer, or of a ‘school of writers’, than as the designation of a tribe of collectors, annotators and editors”. “Siglum” is the poetic license this school freely allows itself. It has no place in prose in connection with this topic. P has 41 per cent. He is described minutely by Dr. Driver, and his horoscope finely determined. Here P is scattered into bits, and stretched out worse than a sailor’s yarn.

Dr. Moore of Andover whisks the non-ethical.
Nirvana. often nonsensical, J, E, P, D into Nirvana.

From individuals they have been attenuated into a straggling procession; now they change into mere stages. Thus they become wholly impersonal. “J, E, JE, D, R, etc., represent not individual authors whose share in the work can be exactly assigned, but *stages in the process*, in which more than one—perhaps many—successive hands participated, every transcription being to some extent a recension.” “J and E represent not individual authors, but a succession of writers; the historiography of a certain period and school”.†

This is the final and conclusive word. Science found out very

‡Hex., p. 315.

§History of Israel, p. 327.

¶Int., p. 19

soon that the theory had no facts on which to base the existence of their imagined authors. Every test fairly applied led to that conclusion, but it is well that a theological professor should make the honest avowal.

What can the honest advocate of the new theory do? He may ignore all this and proceed with the arguments, which have been completely refuted, and block progress in that manner. Or he can drop considerable of the debris which the theory has obliged him to carry, and find food for reflection as he contemplates the procession which gave the Hexateuch to man.

HISTORY—calm-eyed, trustful, resting securely as the servant of God—holds the Book she has carried on the waves thus far, as endowed with divine life, has not a single fact in her bosom to suggest that a procession could write such life-giving records as the early books of the Bible.

SCIENCE—relentless in her demands—has no mercy for a theory which confesses bankruptcy at the first and repudiates the primary axioms of all search for truth.

PHILOSOPHY points to history as her crystallized teaching, and shows that composite books are wholly of late origin. That such a joint product as an encyclopædia is scarcely more than a century old; that the writing of pseudepigrapha is much later than the latest date given to the sacred writings, except Daniel; and that the theory is naught but subjective opinion. In that case it certainly requires the disadvantage of the honest heart to enable one to accept a theory which lacks any objective foundation.

ART finds no confirmity to truth, no adaptation for good, no perception of beauty in this boastful hypothesis.

PROPHECY affirms its right to a place in a biblical theology and is indignant because it is socoolly snubbed. It is a deathless enemy to the assumptions of uninspired original writers.

ETHICS maintains that such low ideals sink any theory, sooner or later.

COMMON SENSE fails to find itself in a theory, which, without any good reason, dashes Moses from his throne and discredits it with a procession of nobodies.

In what way will the apologist turn? He must either, like Dr. Driver, ignore the results of the latest and therefore the

†Moore's Com. on Judges, pp. 38 and 27.

ripest scholarship which sounds the knell of these creatures of fancy, and treat the subject as though they were at least mummies, or he must labor painfully to convince himself and others that a long string of men could take the sacred books of the Jews, and, instead of a hodge-podge, produce a volume which would extort the homage and reverence of mankind. Nay, more: a volume which would produce men, the hardest fruit to raise in the universe. It is just as reasonable to suppose that a dozen blind men who had never been in a printing office before could march up to the printer's "case" and pick up type which, put together in that order, would make a word, as that a procession reaching from 800 B. C. to 300 B. C. could write such books as the Hexateuch.

There are two things which give the theory vitality. (*a*). It was the last theory possible. So De Wette said. It completes, he claimed, the circle of possible theories of the origin of the Pentateuch. Hence, there is no other in which to slip. Preceding theories have been stronger dialectically. Dr. Kuenen said, as late as 1860, that the arguments of this theory were not worthy of refutation. That was several years before he accepted it. (*b*). The endorsement of Christian scholars, which will be a wonder to the student of fifty years hence, has continued its life.

II.—SURE TESTS OF DEATH.

Persons have been buried alive. The tests for death are more difficult than is generally supposed. Sometimes relatives have refused to believe that death had really occurred. With a darling theory that is a very natural course. Admirers of Webster voted for him for president after he was dead. Buddhism is dead among the intellectual classes in Japan, but the momentum of the past preserves it as a form, and the priests are trying to revive it by various expedients called "New Buddhism". So with the development theory. Some men will never discover, or at least will never admit, that it is dead. What is a test of the death of a theory? Once the writer remarked to a Buddhist: "Your papers speak of Buddhism as a corpse. There is no resurrection for a corpse." "That," said he, "is language applicable to tangible and material things. Buddhism is a system. It may be made to live again." That led to an examination of the features of Buddhism which are true. So in this case, it can be

safely affirmed that nothing that is true can die. That preserves the large body of truth held by the evangelical school. But the Grafian theory—we are feeling for some sure test of death.

The way will be paved toward that conclusion, if an exhibit is made of the heavy rate of mortality which attends theories born under German skies. It is a tribute to intellectual activity, yet it prepares the mind for the inevitable tomb.

Dr. J. W. Mendenhall took pains to count and classify the different theories, in regard to the sacred writings, which sprang from the fecund German brain. He began with 1850 and continued for forty years.

He tabulated them as follows:

Genesis.....	16 theories
Exodus.....	13 theories
Leviticus.....	22 theories
Numbers.....	8 theories
Deuteronomy.....	17 theories

76 theories

Joshua.....	10 theories
Judges.....	7 theories
Ruth.....	4 theories
1 and 2 Samuel.....	20 theories
1 and 2 Kings.....	24 theories
1 and 2 Chronicles...	17 theories
Ezra.....	14 theories
Nehemiah.....	11 theories
Esther.....	6 theories

113 theories

The remaining books of the Old Testament furnished 350, a total of 539.

Matthew.....	7 theories
Mark.....	10 theories
Luke.....	9 theories
John.....	15 theories

41 theories

Acts had.....	12 theories
Romans	15 theories
1 and 2 Corinthians.	18 theories
Galatians.....	11 theories
Ephesians.....	8 theories
Philippians.....	8 theories
Colossians.....	12 theories
1 and 2 Thessalonians	9 theories
1 and 2 Timothy....	12 theories
Titus.....	6 theories
Philippians.....	4 theories
Hebrews.....	8 theories
James.....	5 theories
1 and 2 Peter.....	7 theories
1, 2 and 3 John.....	13 theories
Jude.....	7 theories
Revelations	12 theories

167 theories

Add Gospels..... 41 theories

Total in New Testa-

ment.....208 theories

Add Old Testament.539 theories

747 theories

Of these 603 were defunct at the time of writing—1891. Of the 144, many were struggling with the second summer, so fatal to infancy. Many are never christened, they perish prematurely. Others are soon smothered by new substitutes, so they never cut the first tooth. The mortality is estimated at one hundred annually.† It is, therefore, no rare thing for a theory to die, while precious to those who have supposed its years to be those of truth's—the years of God. In this case the admonitions were numerous. All other theories that displaced Moses found out to their overthrow that he who slew an Egyptian had lost no strength in the contest with a German.

†Methodist Quarterly, March, 1891.

Nearly a score of years have passed since Prof. Mead showed that it was just as scientific to make four writers out of Romans as it is out of the Pentateuch. This should have been convincing to the friends of the anemic theory.

Then the language of the traditionalist was so uniform, so exact, so unchangeable, so often merely a transcript of the words of the Bible, that any one not already pledged, could realize that it was the word of which Jesus affirmed that heaven and earth should pass away, but that word should remain. The tossing to and fro, the dissension as to the number, place, time, extent of the writing of each of the writers assumed (until they were evaporated into nothingness), were ample proof of a high fever. The ascription of the dear names J, E, P, D, R, to a crowd will be pronounced delirium by the next man who attempts to rehabilitate the theory.

Few Scholars

Accept.

Suppose that it can be shown that the development theory has been definitely tested and rejected by the soundest thinkers, the best scholars of the literary world, will not that be decisive? One of the new school will affirm, has affirmed, that the arguments appear to most Bible students irrefutable.† If it can be proved that this is so far erroneous, that the Bible students who have been converted to the new view do not in any country reach 3 per cent., will it not justify the conviction that its friends are carrying a mummy?

"In criticism, as in politics, the voice of the innovators, even though they may not be numerous, cries aloud, and this gives the impression of numbers, while the conservative opinion of the majority is unheard and unnoticed."—*Bishop Lightfoot*.

Macauley says that James II was accustomed to prove any controverted point by repeating it in a louder voice and a more vehement manner. Being dead, he still speaketh. The repeated and emphatic mutual assurance of the possession of all scholarship (well, "all competent and independent investigators") and of the majority of Bible students is reiterated as though there was considerable doubt on the part of those making the comforting assertion.

† "Arguments which appear to most Bible students incapable of refutation."

—H. L. Willett, *Christian Evangelist*, 1900, p. 393.

Dr. Briggs surveyed the globe in 1897. The theory had been advanced more than three score years. Dr. Briggs had known it for thirty. In 1863 Dr. Green issued a book in defense of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch against Bishop Colenso. That would be thirty-four years investigation in the United States. It would be over sixty in Germany. In neither country did he count one convert a year. We presume that Dr. Briggs would be able to judge when any one furnished satisfactory evidences of conversion to the new view. He found in Germany, not limiting the list to the theological departments, forty scholars who had signified assent.† Two German universities have not a name on his list, eight others have but one each. In 1890, the total teaching force of the universities of Germany was 2437. Some universities with more than a hundred professors and docenten can afford but one "competent and independent investigator".

Subtracting the docenten, who are simply of lower rank, from the entire faculty we have 2437—649 or 1788 of professorial rank. At that rate of conversion it will require 4470 years to bring in the professors in German universities alone. Alas! No German theory was ever known to last that long.

<p>Not One Per Cent in European Universities</p>	<p>In Continental Europe, outside of Germany, Dr. Briggs found twenty-four adherents in fourteen universities. There are fifty-one universities in that territory which refused him a name.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

In Great Britain he counted twenty-two professors in universities and colleges. We have not a catalogue of the institutions of learning, in the British empire, but we notice that St. Andrews, Dublin, Royal and Durham universities and the University college of Liverpool have no representative on his roll. He makes strange bedfellows. The sainted Drummond is classed with the scoffing Wellhausen, the noble and lovable W. R. Smith with the reckless Vernes. In all Europe, omitting the college named, there are fifty-seven universities which had no man for that catalogue. Among all peoples speaking the Teutonic, Romance and English languages he finds 106. Canada does not have one, but Australia is there. From the fact that there are 5,000 of professional rank in the United States, an estimate of 12,000

†Briggs: *Hexateuch*, p. 144

may not be too high for the world. If not too high then there is not 1 per cent. in the colleges and universities, where men are the first to catch a new truth. Unless there is a more marked work of grace, these institutions will require six thousand years for the complete work of conversion.

Dean Farrar is with the new critics on Daniel, and is thus friendly. He wrote in the *Expositor*, in 1896: "In England, such is the ignorance of professed interpreters, the belief that the Elohist and Javistic documents were separate can hardly even yet be said to be generally accepted".

To the twenty-two Dr. Briggs found in the **England Conservative**. British isles there could be interposed the revisers of King James version. That was a body of men of the highest scholarship in the realm. They outnumber Dr. Briggs's list and embrace the best Hebraists of the English tongue. All their lives were spent in knowledge of that theory, yet it did not appear to them to be sustained.

Another body of picked scholars are the writers of the *Speaker's Commentary*. Suggested by the Right Hon. J. Evelyn Denison, Speaker of the House, it was edited with all the ability England could command. It reaches to the palace and to the university. There are thirty-seven names in that roll of honor. Not one bowed to the new hypothesis. The *Pulpit Commentary* is divided. Prof. Cheyne and Dean Farrar are on the list of expositors. Excluding the contributors to the homiletic sections, there are thirteen names of critics of the word who are not convinced. "*Lex Mosaica*" is a huge conservative work, devoted to the historical argument. It has fourteen writers. Omitting names that are found elsewhere in this list we have twelve more who have not been able to see any light in that theory of nescience. This gives more than one hundred of renowned scholars of England to offset the twenty-two.

One of the writers of *Lex Mosaica*, Prof. Sayce, **Strong Names**, accepts the late origin of Daniel, but from archaeological researches concludes that the theory that Moses wrote the Pentateuch is the true one. The names we have quoted are those of critical writers on the Old Testament only. Such names as Pusey, Alford, Lightfoot, who

have left the earth; of Westcott, Ellicott, and Wace, who are with us, are not of those who endorse the German hypothesis.

The International Critical Commentary is to be placed to the credit of the eminent scholars who adhere to the Grafian hypothesis. In that announcement, in the Old Testament division, only one name appears which was not embraced in Dr. Briggs's roll. This would indicate, though not prove, a paucity of scholars on that side.

The only statistics we have of Great Britain is imperfect as to colleges. If we limit to universities, Dr. Briggs finds adherents in four, while in an equal number there is none.

The number of Bible students in the United States and Canada rises above a million. There are that many teachers and officers in the Sunday schools. There are on a conservative estimate 120,000 ministers. There are 5000 teachers in the universities, colleges and theological seminaries of the United States of professional rank. The total would be 1,125,000. One per cent. of these would be 11,250. Dr. Briggs, in 1897, counted nineteen besides himself. He was counting the professors, not limiting himself to the theological chairs.

The strongest theological faculty in the United States, possibly in the world, is that of Yale. Individual professors may be found to excel in special lines, or even in peculiar talents. It is probable that no other faculty has issued so many brainy books during the past thirty years. Samuel Harris gave us "The Self Revelation of God" and "The Philosophical Basis of Theism" which are spiritual ascents of mountains. But we must not attempt the list. As the faculty stands today, there are Day, Fisher, Brastow, Curtis, Stevens, Blackman, Porter, Bacon and four instructors. In this list Dr. Briggs has Bacon and Curtis only. From another department he lists Dr. Ladd. Only three in Yale. The Presbyterians have twelve different bodies in the United States. Out of all the Presbyterian seminaries, only two are in his number. Of the Methodist, United Brethren and Christian theological institutions, he has not one.

There are three hundred and seventy colleges and universities in the territory where Dr. Briggs finds twenty professors believing the new way. Only fourteen are found to furnish a name out

of the three hundred and seventy. On a modest estimate there are a hundred institutions where the Bible is systematically taught in the United States. There are 140 different religious bodies, some have several seminaries, so the estimate is within bounds. In these one hundred devoted to Bible study, only nine have any one who has satisfied Dr. Briggs that he is a genuine convert.

Ask any competent judge to name the most scholarly man who has adorned the American pulpit during this century. R. S. Storrs or Joseph Cook would probably be named. Neither was a convert to the new theory.

The Presbyterians with whom Dr. Briggs was connected have a ministry of eight thousand. Every one is a college graduate. The doctor had ample time and opportunity to convince these thousands of competent scholars, but made a mortifying failure. He did not carry any with him.

There are seven men who studied this question during thirty years. Every one was an American, a Hebraist, acquainted with the German tongue, and a professor in a theological seminary. Their names are as follows: C. A. Briggs, W. H. Green, E. C. Bissell, Howard Osgood, C. M. Mead, M. B. Riddle, and J. W. MacDill. The first is the only one who accepted the theory. He has made more noise than all the others. He, alone, tells of his scholarship, and lets his reader know that he belongs to that select circle. He, alone, uses such an appeal as, "In the field of scholarship the question is settled". Four of the others were appointed on the committee of revision of the Scriptures. This is the highest honor awarded to American scholarship.

When Dr. Briggs published his list, in 1897, of twenty professors in the United States who accepted the Grafian theory, thirty-four years had passed since Dr. Green had published the first book in this line that was issued by an American. The result of the agitation was one convert every twenty months. That was a slow rate among men who were reading constantly along these lines. Unless the work of removing theories which render the Bible incapable of intelligent apprehension is accelerated, it will require more than eight thousand years to bring the teachers of professional rank in this country into the company. Therefore, is not the claim of having most Bible students (twenty, anyhow) a little premature?

If it be computed that there are as many preachers as there are professors, who have accepted the new way, that would be forty in the United States of educated persons who believe the theory. Since out of eight thousand ministers Dr. Briggs took none with him (unless it was Prof. McGiffert), the estimate of twenty ought to be sufficiently large. They have made considerable noise. In your own acquaintance in the ministry you would probably be unable to surpass Dr. Briggs's estimate. However, multiply this estimate by 500 per cent. and there will be a hundred in the United States. Out of the ministry alone there will then be one-twelfth of one per cent. who adhere to the new teaching. When the theory has had sixty years of life, has been known in America for more than half that time and has only one-twenty-fifth of one per cent. of the professors, and not one-twelfth of one per cent. of the ministers in the nation, is it not a mathematical demonstration that the people of the United States have by their educated men heard, tested and rejected the Grafian theory? How could demonstration be stronger? Surely the theory is dead.

III—THE MOURNERS.

There are two families of mourners, but not a large number, taken together.

The customary words of consolation, "Whomt he gods lovedie young", being understood, the evangelical critics, who have supposed that this theory would redeem Israel from the theories which rendered the Bible incapable of intelligent apprehension by Paul, Apollis and the mighty men who have adorned the succeeding centuries, are not to forget the compensations which attend every sorrow.

Belief came high in the Grafian theory. To be in opposition to Moses, to apologize for the King, to have war with the history, and discord with science, to be under an unphilosophical method and to endorse an unscientific theory of evolution, to defend a low ideal in ethics and to be condemned by the rules of art, is costly, too costly for the meagre and doubtful advantage of being in a guild which was smiled at on account of the vociferous claim to all scholarship. Again, that belief cannot be transmitted. It demands a peculiar nidus for its growth. Grotius either wrote the Declaration of Independence or he did not. It is written in the spirit of that great thinker, but that does not make him the author. So Moses wrote the law or he did not. Moses wrote of

Christ or he did not, there is no *tertium quid*. Few men can carry exclusive opinions, to them those affirmations are either true or they are false. To believe the simple plain and oft repeated declarations of the Mosaic authorship of various portions (practically covering all) of the Pentateuch and to believe the theory which does not ascribe a word to Moses is a self-evident contradiction which can seldom be conveyed to another mind. A man may, out of respect for a revered teacher, think that he really believes both, but he, in fact, imposes on himself, as Kant did with his noted antinomies which disappear under hard thinking. This case does not require hard thinking, for the contradiction is not between the reason and understanding, it is a question of fact.

The advocate has this consolation: his teaching from henceforth can be positive and indubitable. Before, if he induced a man to think that the early Scriptures could not be believed, except in a Pickwickian sense, he started that man on a road which has led many a man to total indifference to the things of God. Disbelief in the veracity of the Old Testament, is disbelief in that which Jesus believed to be true. The little rift from His faith widens till the sweetest music of life is gone. That is with the common man. Dr. Briggs's list of believers is composed of men who are embalmed among the good, in theological seminaries, separated by the width of a college curriculum, and a course in theology from a sinning, suffering, sobbing world. So the man man who loves his race may breathe a sigh of relief, that any teaching of the theory will be considered by some, at least, in his audience as an evidence of a belated mind. He may even consider that they will judge him to be indifferent to the fate of some who might be led astray and thus forfeit life eternal.

An Instance. Dr. J. M. Buckley preached a sermon before the students of Cornell, in which he told this incident: "A preacher in Scotland preached and published a number of sermons. A woman in New York read and pondered over them till she lost faith. Dying of a lingering disease, she told her pastor that she was not able to believe anything positively. After her death the author was summoned to answer on a charge of heresy, that book being the basis. He admitted that he had uttered those things too hastily; he had changed his mind and did not believe that some of his objec-

tionable conclusions were justified by the premises. But an intelligent woman had died in doubt and darkness, misled by his sophistry." If it were better that a millstone were tied to one's neck, and he be cast into the sea, than that he should cause one of these little ones to offend, surely it were better to call a halt before one speaks or prints a word which would cause doubt of the truthfulness of the record God has given of his law.

Still another reason may lessen the poignancy
A Narrow View. of the grief of this small but estimable family.

Dr. John Hall in his Yale Lectures said that a minister in a small denomination was hindered from obtaining a full-orbed view of truth, because he must continually defend the separate existence of his denomination. The adherent of a small and select guild is under the same pressure.

It must be evident that the constant appeal to scholarship was humiliating. There are two factors to be considered. Men of real attainments are as humble as Newton. Then the true scholar does not care whether scholarship is with him or not. At least it is not of any weight in reaching conclusions. His objective is the truth, not men. There are two causes for the prolonged life of the hypothesis. One was expressed by De Wette at the birth. It was necessary, he said, that this should be brought out, for only thus could the circle of possible hypotheses, in regard to the origin of the Pentateuch, be complete. If there had been room for another, doubtless the fertile German mind would have slipped into that years ago and this have been swept in derision, from the table to lie with the wrecks of the former theories, which thought that they knew more than Moses. Another cause of comparative longevity was the adherence of some excellent Christian scholars. That phase of thought is destined to a place in the psychological museum, labelled probably "Vagaries of Theologians". The marvel lies in the advocacy of a theory, which openly admitted that it was from a standpoint antagonistic to the Scriptures and the Church. That Christian scholars did not see that belief in that, was incompatible with an acceptance of the Bible, as the Book of God, veracious in all important statements, will be the wonder of the student of the future. It is already to some.

Turning to the other class of mourners, we **Unbelievers Are the** concede they have reason to mourn. And yet **True Mourners.** they ought to be accustomed to it. All their theories make an early start toward the cemetery. They are the unbelievers. They know the value the theory was to them and bear cheerful testimony to its good service in the interests of unbelief. O. B. Jenkins is one of those men who file objections to the Bible because it did not teach science or confer material benefits directly to man. Writing in the *Arena* (vol. 19, p. 771) he continues: "Nor according to Dr. Briggs himself does the literature afford any good specimen of historical composition. On the contrary in the department of history in his own words it is quite disappointing." He says Briggs shows "the imaginary character of the heretofore supposed historical incidents of the three books, Jonah, Ruth and Esther". "We now know the opening chapters of Gen. to be a bit of Accadian fable and what Prof. Briggs airily refers to as interesting poems." The same article quotes with evident pleasure Lyman Abbott, "who is not the best authority on the subject", as saying "the first seventeen books of the Bible are not original productions by contemporaries, and eye witnesses of the events they describe, but are compilations from earlier writings." It is unnecessary to multiply such quotations. They abound. The hypothesis had that aim from the beginning and was nourished by men who did not conceal their belief that Israel was but common clay. For their loss we can have no sympathy, it is the victory of a scholarly and scientific higher criticism. Their theory was slanderous of the Old Testament, subversive of the New, and inimical to the progress and happiness of the race.

In conclusion, we beg the lenient judgment of **The Writ of Eject-** the reader, if, in earnest discussion, we have **ment Against Moses** been guilty of expressing contempt or even dis- **Failed.** respect for any man. It was not intentional. The published opinions of any man are public property. These we have endeavored to test, but never to lay hands on a man.

Few men can see facts, arrayed and made to march and counter-march over their opinions, as Washington did over the grave of Braddock, without feeling resentment at the writer. Is it

necessary to say anything in advocacy of the traditional view of the Pentateuch? Hardly. It is well known. It remains with no change to speak of from century to century. What Joshua and David said, what Hilkiah and Huldah affirmed, what Ezra and Malachi believed, and what Jesus and Paul taught, is identical with what Bissell and Green taught before they went higher, and what is believed by the mass of intelligent persons and the deepest thinkers who believe the Bible. It does not need apologetics; it needs only statement. Now that you have bought the book we will tell you a better one. It is *The Book*. The anvil which breaks all the hammers forged by the Vulcans of unbelief. Read the Pentateuch anew. Read trying to believe that it was written by an irresponsible procession of wandering scribes, each one changing it from what it was, as Dr. Moore affirms; then read it as the product of a master mind, yea of two master minds, for God wrote some with his own finger, and Moses wrote more by the knowledge God gave him.

To present the evidence for the Mosaic authorship would be to write a volume. The traditional view is historical, scientific, biblical, psychological, artistic, ethical and divine. There is salvation beyond it. It is systematic, it is antique, it is perfectly adapted to the time and to the people, it is consistent, it has a purpose, it has God.

Moses lived. He lives now. He was a genius.
Moses a Marvel. In his babyhood his tears were eloquent, they unlocked the heart of a princess and the doors of the palace. Educated in all the wisdom of the most highly civilized nation of his day, he was farsighted enough to be patriotic, to stand with the oppressed and to flee Egypt to win heaven. At eighty he took charge of a horde of trembling slaves and compacted them into an army of prowess, a nation of force. He gave a law which in its principles is imperishable. His arm reaches across the centuries and moulds the statutes of every state. Idolatry crumbles before his appearance. Everywhere that Moses is unknown it lifts its horrid form, it debases its devotees.

He has modified the Draconian severity which, in all other legal systems, slew for petty crimes, he has made the widow, the stranger, the fatherless, to be objects of solicitude; he has taught the nations that national sins have their sure retribution. His

law was the slave that led multitudes to know the true God and untold numbers to worship Christ. As soon can Spain retake Cuba as any unbelieving theory take the Pentateuch from Moses. He is well presented by the colossal marble, carved by Michael Angelo in St. John's at Rome. With horns of strength protruding from his head, he looks the hero who slew the Egyptian, smote Egypt with darkness and terror, divided the Red Sea, stood on the mount with the glories of God, snatched water from the flinty rock and laws from heaven, wrote the sublimest poem of creation the world has seen, sang an epic to which heaven and earth gave ear, was smothered to death by the kisses of love from the lips of God, buried in an unknown sepulchre, yet living, appearing on the Mount of Transfiguration, and crushing idolatry today, influencing the dominant civilization by his heaven-born laws, he is like the mountain rock of Gibraltar, thrusting himself far out in the sea of humanity to turn its currents according to God's will, while the petty theories which would dethrone him in order to exalt the critic, break as harmless wavelets unnoticed at his feet.

Appendix.

NOTE A.

In his article on Deuteronomy Dr. Driver says that the early prophets—Amos, Hosea, and the undisputed parts of Isaiah—show no certain traces of this influence. Jeremiah exhibits marks of it on nearly every page; Ezekiel and 2d Isaiah are evidently influenced by it.

Any one with a good reference Bible can test this assertion. By saturating himself with Deuteronomy, then reading the other books, he can also become convinced that Dr. Driver has stated the facts backward:

AMOS.

Chapter.

1:4
4:4
4:6
4:7
4:5
4:9
4:10
4:11
4:13
5:11
5:14
6:12
7:3
8:14
9:4
9:7
9:14, 15

DEUTERONOMY.

Chapter.

3:11
14:28 and 26:12
28:17, 38, 40
28:23, 24
12:6
28:21, 22, 38, 42
28:2b? 26, 27, 60, and 7:15
28:30, 39, and 29:23
32:13 and 33:29
28:30
30:15, 19
29:18
32:36
6:13 and 9:21
28:65
2:23
30:3, 5, 9

Eighteen times Amos refers to Deuteronomy.

HOSEA.	DEUTERONOMY.
<i>Chapter.</i>	<i>Chapter.</i>
1:2	31:16
2:10	32:39
3:3	21:13
4:4	17:12
4:14	31:16, 17
5:10	19:14 and 21:17
5:14	32:39
6:1	32:39
8:1	28:49
8:12	4:6
8:13	28:68
8:14	31:16, 17
9:3	28:36
9:4	26:14
9:10	4:3 and 32:10
10:8	28:63
11:8	29:23
11:8, 9	32:36
12:6	10:12
12:12, 13	26:5, 8
13:4, 6	8:14-16
13:9	32:5
13:12	32:34

Hosea refers to Deuteronomy twenty-six times.

Next, the undisputed portions of Isaiah :

1ST ISAIAH.	DEUTERONOMY.
<i>Chapter.</i>	<i>Chapter.</i>
1:2	32:1
1:6	28:27, 35
1:7	28:62
1:9	4:27 and 29:23
1:10	32:32
1:17	28:27
1:19	28:1
1:24	28:63
2:6	18:14

1ST. ISAIAH

DEUTERONOMY.

*Chapter.**Chapter.*

3:5

28:50

5:2

32:6

5:24, 25

28:20, 24, 25

5:26-29

28:49-52

6:11, 12

28:36, 64, 65

7:4

20:3

7:15, 16

1:39

8:17

31:17

8:19

18:10? 11

8:20

12:28 and 13:5

10:1, 2

17:19

17:10

32:15

19:3

18:10, 11

30:1

29:19

30:9

32:20

30:17

28:25 and 32:30

31:5

32:11

Thirty-one verses in 1st Isaiah refer to Deuteronomy.

These are the prophets who wrote before Deuteronomy was written, hence could not be expected to quote from that book.

We now examine the prophets who are, by universal consent, later than Deuteronomy. Since Dr. Driver had Zephaniah in earlier additions, and he was after Deuteronomy, we count him in the number:

ZEPHANIAH.

DEUTERONOMY.

*Chapter.**Chapter.*

1:13

28:30

1:17

28:29

3:19, 20

26:19

JEREMIAH.

DEUTERONOMY.

*Chapter.**Chapter.*

1:8

31:6

1:12

32:35

1:16

28:20

2:13

33:20.

JEREMIAH.

Chapter.

2:22
 2:28
 3:1
 3:2
 4:2
 4:4
 4:13
 5:7
 5:15, 17
 5:17
 5:19
 5:23
 6:12
 7:6
 7:7
 7:12
 7:22
 7:24
 7:31
 7:33
 8:10
 9:16
 10:16
 11:3-5
 11:12
 12:14
 12:15
 13:15
 14:14, 15
 15:3
 15:4
 16:6
 16:7
 16:10
 16:13
 16:10-13
 17:4

DEUTERONOMY.

Chapter.

32:34
 32:37
 24:4
 12:2
 10:20
 10:11
 28:49
 32:15
 28:49-52
 29:24
 28:48
 21:18
 28:30
 6:14 and 8:19 and 11:28
 4:40
 12:11
 6:3
 29:19
 17:3
 28:26
 28:30
 28:64
 32:9
 27:26 and 4:20 and 6:3
 32:37
 30:3
 32:29
 32:30
 18:20
 28:26
 32:22
 14:1
 26:14
 29:24
 28:36
 29:25-28
 32:22

JEREMIAH.

DEUTERONOMY.

*Chapter.**Chapter.*

17:25	4:40
18:15	32:21
19:4	28:20
19:7	28:25
19:9	28:53
21:7	28:50
21:8	30:19
22:8	29:24
22:13	24:14
23:4	1:21
23:6	33:28
23:14	32:32
23:27	13:1
23:30	18:20
24:7	30:6
24:8, 9	28:25
26:2	12:5
26:4	28:15
27:9	18:10
28:9	18:22
28:14	28:48 and 13:5
28:17	32:35
29:13	30:1
29:14	4:29
30:3	30:3
30:10, 11	1:21
31:2	1:33
31:5	28:30
31:19	30:2
31:32	1:31
32:17	3:24
32:18	5:9, 10
32:21	4:34
32:22	1:8 and 6:3
32:37	30:3
32:41	30:9
33:9	26:19

JEREMIAH.

Chapter.

33:16

34:13, 14

34:17

34:20

36:4

38:7

40:2

40:3

40:8

40:10

41:5

41:17

42:6

42:10

42:15, 19

43:10

44:17

46:10

47:5

48:19

48:40

49:18

49:31

50:40

51:6

51:46

51:56

52:4

DEUTERONOMY.

Chapter.

33:28

15:12

28:25, 64

28:26

28:15 and 29:18 and 31:16, 17

21:19

28:15-68 and 29:18-29 and 30:17,
18 and 31:17 and 32:19, 25

29:24, 25

1:38

16:13

14:1

28:65, 68

6:3

32:36

17:16

13:16 and 32:17

23:23

32:42

14:14

2:36

28:49

29:23

33:28

29:23

32:35

20:3

32:35

28:52-57

One hundred and seventeen verses in Jeremiah refer to Deuteronomy.

EZEKIEL.

Chapter.

4:14

5:10

5:13

DEUTERONOMY.

Chapter.

14:3, 21

28:53, 64

32:36

EZEKIEL.

DEUTERONOMY.

*Chapter.**Chapter.*

5:16	32:23, 24
7:15	32:25
7:26	32:23
8:3	32:16
8:6	31:16
8:16	4:19
11:2	12:30
14:8	28:37
16:13	32:13
16:15	32:15
16:41	32:16
16:43	32:32
16:59	29:12, 14
17:5	8:7-9
17:15	17:16
18:7	24:12 and 15:7
18:19	5:9
18:20	24:16
18:25	32:4
19:10	8:7
19:13	28:48
20:5	7:6 add 4:34
20:6, 7	29:16
20:6, 15	6:3
20:9	9:28
20:11	4:8
20:12	5:12
20:19	5:32, 33 and 6:1 and 7:11 and 8:1, 6 and 10:13 and 11:1 and 12:1
20:21	9:23, 24 and 31:27
20:23	4:27 and 28:64
20:40	26:2
21:2	32:2
21:9	32:41
22:7	27:16
22:12	16:19 and 23:19

EZEKIEL.

DEUTERONOMY.

*Chapter.**Chapter.*

22:15

4:27 and 28:64

23:10

29:22

23:46

28:25

23:48

13:11

24:7

12:16

27:5

3:9

28:5

8:12-14

36:2

32:13

36:5

4:24

36:22

9:5

36:30

32:14

36:32

9:5

37:3

32:39

38:8

4:30

39:12

21:23

39:18

32:14

39:23

31:17

42:13

21:5

44:15

10:8

44:24

17:8

44:28

19:9

44:30

26:2

45:21

16:1

45:25

16:13

46:5

16:17

46:9

16:16

47:17

32:51

48:15

20:5

Sixty-seven verses in Ezekiel refer to Deuteronomy.

Driver's analysis is our authority for the chapters which form 2d Isaiah.

34:1

32:1

34:16

32:34

40:25

4:15

41:10

31:6

41:23

18:22

43:2

31:6,8

EZEKIEL.	DEUTERONOMY.
<i>Chapter.</i>	<i>Chapter.</i>
44:2	32:16
44:8	32:15
45:5	4:35 and 32:39 and 32:4
45:21	4:35, and 32:39
45:23	6:13
46:3	1:31
46:9	32:7
48:1	6:3
48:4	31:27
48:11	32:26
48:12	32:39
48:18	32:29
50:1	24:1
51:16	18:18
51:17	28:28, 34
56:3	23:1
58:14	32:13 and 33:29
59:10	28:29
62:8	28:31
62:9	12:12 and 14:23, 26, and 16:11, 14
63:9	7:7
65:2	32:5
65:4	18:11
65:6	32:34
65:23	28:4
66:17	14:8

Thirty-three verses of 2d Isaiah refer to Deuteronomy.

Total number of verses in Amos.....	146	References....	18
Total number of verses in Hosea.....	197	References....	26
Total number of verses in 1st Isaiah....	539	References....	31

882

75

One reference in every 11.76 verses.

Second section after Deuteronomy unquestionably written.

Total number of verses—Jeremiah....	1333	References....	117
Ezekiel.....	1273	“	67
2d Isaiah....	553	“	33
Zephaniah... 53		“	4
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	3212		221

One reference in every 14.53.

In reading the first section a reference to Deuteronomy will be met in every twelve verses; in reading the second one in every fifteen verses. This is exactly the opposite of Dr. Driver's assertion. This reveals hasty generalization. It is inaccurate scholarship.

NOTE B—THE FORTY-ONE PHRASES OF DEUTERONOMY.

Every one admits that Deuteronomy has a style different from the other books of the entire Bible. Therefore, the examination of phrases to prove what all admit seems to be superfluous. The strength of the contestant against the Mosaic authorship ought to have been spent in showing that an author could not write in a different style after forty years experience and under totally different prospects. This Dr. Driver overlooked. These are valuable to show that great scholars can blunder.

The first ten phrases are used in earlier portions of the Pentateuch. This is freely admitted by the compiler. Why he listed them as peculiar to Deuteronomy, when he says they were used by JE, does not appear.

No. 11 is used in Kings, Jeremiah, and Isaiah.

No. 14 is used in Exodus, Jeremiah, and Ezra.

No. 19 is used in Joshua, 1st Chronicles (Numbers 14:7 has the same idea).

No. 19 is used in Genesis, 1st Isaiah, and Ezekiel.

No. 25 is used in Exodus, and Jeremiah.

No. 26 is used in Numbers, Judges, Kings.

No. 29 is used in Joshua and Judges.

No. 30 is used in Exodus.

No. 33 is used in Exodus and Numbers.

No. 34 is used in Leviticus.

No. 35 is used in Kings, Jeremiah, Ezra, Nehemiah.

No. 38 is used in Joshua and Kings.

No. 39 is used in Joshua.

No. 40 is used in Numbers, Joshua, and Judges.

This leaves eighteen peculiarities to Deuteronomy. In addition, the claim is made that Deuteronomy influenced later writers. This would give a larger number. Still greater variations have been counted in Milton, or Tennyson, or other writers, than is claimed to exist in Deuteronomy. These distinctive phrases are lifting water in a seive—they prove what no one questions and ignore the real difficulty.

Twenty phrases supposed to be peculiar to H. From Driver's Introduction:

Number 1. "I am Jehovah". Used five times in Exodus 6 and elsewhere. This is a sample of the careless scholarship which so frequently disappoints the friends of the excellent men who embrace the new theory. If they had been more accurate there would be more satisfaction in tracing their steps. There is no profit in taking such clumsy work up in detail. Nos. 5, 17, and 18 are all that are valid instances of phrases peculiar to H. The remaining seventeen are all used elsewhere or nearly the same phraseology is employed.

H, or the section 17 to 26 of Leviticus, is called the law of holiness. But we have compiled a list of the subjects treated. There are sixty different topics treated in that section. The reader will find the following list to be approximately exact. Some topics are treated twice:

Place of sacrifice	Sanctuary
Eating of blood	Wizards
Illegal marriages	Honoring age
Worship of Molech	Strangers
Profane language	Just weights
Beastiality	Distinction between clean and unclean beasts
Honoring parents	Mourning of the priests
Being holy	Holiness of the priests
Idolatry	Marriages of the priests
Peace offerings	Blemishes of the priests
Harvesting	Service of the priests
Stealing	Thank offerings
False witness	Sabbath
Fraud	Passover
Wages	Day of atonement
Deaf and blind	Trumpets
Judgment	

Talebearer	Tabernacles
Hatred	Oil for lamps
Love of neighbor	Shew bread
Cattle	Blasphemy
Sowing seed	Murder
Linsey woolsey	Retaliation
Bondmaid	Sabbath of land
Fruit trees	Jubilee
Enchantments	Redeeming land
Beards	Usury
Tattooing	Bond servant
Selling a daughter	Rewards for obedience
Sabbaths	Punishments

This enumeration is really a rehearsal of the laws of the theocracy. Hence it closes, not by saying, "this is the law of holiness", but with: "These are the statutes and judgments and laws which the Lord made between him and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai, by the hand of Moses." Of "H" that venerable record knows just as much as the modern skeptic,—absolutely nothing.

If a scholar were to choose a section which is specially devoted to the topic of "holiness", he could do no better than to select Leviticus 10 to 15. These do treat on the clean and the unclean. The following are the topics treated:

- Death from use of unhallowed fire.
- Strong drink forbidden to priests.
- Most holy meat offering.
- Eating in the holy place.
- Clean and unclean beasts, birds and fishes.
- Purification of women.
- Cleansing of leprosy, a type of sin.
- Cleansing of a house.
- Uncleanness of men and women.
- Rites for cleansing.

The strong probability is that if Dr. Klosterman had taken this section, instead of the other, the lesser critics would have endorsed the choice; and it is manifest that no one would have

then suggested that from 17 to 26 would be more appropriate. The entire book of Leviticus is occupied with this and kindred topics.

NOTE C.—ARCHÆOLOGY.

Names toward the close of David's reign which honor Jehovah—priests, singers, soldiers, and overseers:

Shemaiah	Rehabiah	Bakkiah	Shephatiah
Jedaiah	Amariah	Mattaniah	Ishmaiah
Malchijah	Isshiah	Meshelemiah	Hoshea
Abijah	Zechariah	Zebediah	Azaziah
Jeshua	Jaaziah	Eliehoenai	Pedaiah
Shecaniah	Nethaniah	Peullethiah	Uzziah
Pethathiah	Gedaliah	Semachiah	Joash
Delaiah	Jeshaiah	Hilkiah	Shitrai
Maaziah	Hashabiah	Tebaliah	Jehediah
Jedeiah	Mattathiah	Jerijah	

Names with El, in honor of God :

Jezekel	Eliezer	Nethanel	Azarel
Jahaziel	Shebuel	Elzebad	Adiel
Uzziel	Eliathah	Zabdiel	Jehiel
Jeremeel	Jediael	Azriel	Eliphael
Eliashib	Jathniel	Jaasiel	

These names are to archaeology what fossil remains of plant or animal are to the geologist. They do not prove that the Bible record is true. They do show that the history is in exact harmony with the indication of the fossils. Any theory which asserts that the history is not reliable must reckon with the names which imply that fidelity. A theory which can account for the etymology of the names imbedded in those early records, and also give a better explanation of the difficulties, will have a fair hearing in the court of letters, and a name to live.

NOTE D.

It is proposed that the reader become a judge of style. Dr. Driver's close and accurate description is followed.

"J excels in the power of delineating life and character. His touch is singularly light, with a few strokes he paints a scene which, before he has finished, is impressed indelibly upon his reader's memory! He states particulars fully; he is the best in-

formed on Egyptian matters; he lends no countenance to unspiritual worship; in the narrative of Joseph he makes it teach the manner in which God effects His purposes through human means, even though it be without the knowledge and contrary to the wishes of the agents who actually bring them about! His aim is to give a systematic view of the origin and chief institutions of the Israelitish theocracy. For this purpose an abstract of the history is sufficient, wherever possible he seeks to set before his readers a concrete picture with definite figures and proportions".

This will be found in Dr. Driver's Introduction, pp. 118 to 127. If the reader has a conception of such a writer, we will reveal his name. It is Moses. True Dr. Driver does not call him by that name. He divides him into three. In fact, the above is a description of E, J, and P. The exclamation points are the dividing signs for the respective letters. Moses certainly covers all, for the reader, we venture to say, did not discover any discordant note in the above which began with J and ended with P.

We submit three chapters given to these three, let the reader guess which is J, E, or P. Gen. 1, 3 and 15. These have been told in the body of this work. Gen. 20 (except the last verse), 23 and 38 are also three chapters each given to a different writer. The reader can test the ability of any critic to tell which chapter belongs to any one of these letters. The reading of these will show how slender the basis of different styles.

NOTE E.

8. Hundred. **מאה**. *Meath*, instead of *meah*. The first form is the construct state, the second the absolute. Gesenius's Heb. Gram., Mitchell's 2d Ed. of Gesenius, p. 32.

Scissors's exegesis. Moses used the stronger form for great events. E, J and P all use the milder form. J would have used the construct state in Gen. 8:3: "And the waters returned from off the earth continually; and after the end of the one hundred and fifty days the waters were abated." Can the reader see any reason why one man could not have written all that verse? Is there the slightest evidence that 450 years elapsed between the writing of the first and second halves? You have all the data. It is arbitrarily cut into two. Why? "Hundred" is the construct state. This J would have used if the scissors had not cut it away from him. That clause is given to P. Then the argu-

ment stands, "P always uses the construct state". 7:24 is a single verse given to P by the same exegesis.

9. *יָיָא*. To die. *Gava*. This is the poetical or majestic word *Muth* the ordinary word. Nu 20:3 verse divided.

10. (a). "With thee, or with him, etc., appended to an enumeration". Statistics, enumerations, formal genealogies and ritual law are always given to P. Gen. 7:7 is J "in the main". Gen. 13:1 is J. Gen. 24:32 J is similar.

(b). "Thy (or your) seed after you". This is valid yet in Gen. 35:12 and in 48:4 five verses are cut out and given to P. They contain this phrase.

11. "Thus did Noah; according to all that God commanded him so did he," Gen. 6:22.

"And Noah did according to all that the Lord commanded", Gen. 7:5. Would you think that one man could not write both these sentences? The theory says it requires two; "according to" is the difficult phrase. It is P. But 7:5 is J. The surgical exegesis is necessary even for this. Ex. 12:28, one verse cut out of J's side.

12. "The self same day". Used by H, Lev. 23:14, 21, and by JE, Jos. 10:27.

The surgeon cuts four verses out of the close of Deut. 32d and three out of Jos. 5th in order to secure this phrase for P.

13. "After their families". A single verse is cut out of J, Gen. 10:20. According to their families is the same word with a different suffix. It is the same meaning, used by J, Ex. 12:21, JE Nu. 11:19 and Jos. 7:14, 17:2 bis.

14. *לְכָל* "as regards all".

Used by E: Gen. 42:6, Ex. 1:22; by H, Lev. 22:18; by JE, Num. 11:13.

15. "Everlasting covenant". But J, E, and D use both these words; but both together occur only six times—three times in one chapter, Gen. 17th. Once it is used by H.

16. "Exceeding" *מְאֹד* *mad*. One verse cut out from J, Ex. 1:7.

17. "Substance", *rekush*. Used by E, Gen. 15:14. Used four times in Gen. 14th, the orphaned chapter. In Gen. 13:6 one verse cut out for P.

18. The cognate verb. "To get substance". Gen. 31:18, a half verse is excised for P. It appears but four times in all of Genesis.

19. "Soul". (Used for person.) *Nephesh*. Dr. Driver says that the use is not peculiar to P. But that is what we are seeking.

20. "Throughout (or in) your generation". Used three times by H. "Unto all generations" is used by E. Ex. 3:15.

21. "Sojournings". One and a fifth verses are cut out of Gen. 37:1, 2 to give this word to P. It is used in Gen. 17:8, to which there are four references. That is all. The cognate verb "sojourn" is used by E, Gen. 21:23; by J, Gen. 32:4; by JE, Gen. 21:34.

22. "Possession". *אחוז*, *achuzzah*. Also used by H, Lev. 25:45; JE, Num. 32:5, 22; D2, Jos. 22:4. Two verses cut out for P, Gen. 50:13.

23. "To get possession". Gen. 47:27, 28 one and a half verses cut out for P's benefit.

24. "Purchase, or purchased, possession". Used by H, Lev.

25. Dr. Driver says it is probably a legal term. All legal terms are given to P.

25. "People in the sense of kinsfolk". (a). Used by J, Gen. 27:29; E, Ex. 19:5; H, Lev. 23:29; by D, Deut. 2:25—all in the plural. Dr. Driver seems to limit his quotation to the phrase "that soul shall be cut off from his people". Then it becomes the penalty for violated law, and by the constitution of the theory it is the property of P. It occurs in the middle books, except once; then it is in regard to the law of circumcision. (b). "To be gathered to one's people". Applied to death of six great men, from Abraham to Moses. In the last instance a few verses are taken from D and given to P. In Gen. 15:15, "thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace", an equivalent expression, is given to E by Driver; to JE by others. N is also used by H.

26. "Settler", or "sojourner", *toshab*. Only once in Genesis; all other places are legal sections. Used by H, Lev. 22:10, 23:23.

27. "Getting", "possession". Into the midst of a long E chapter P swoops down and takes three-fourths of a verse, Gen. 31:18, because this word is there. Gen. 34:27 has it. This chapter changes writers thirty-one times to suit the theory: Used by H, Lev. 25:6, 23.

28. "Rigor", *פֶּרֶךְ*, *perek*. Twice only in P, Ex. 11:13, 14; then the two verses were cut. Used by H.

29. "Judgments", *שֵׁפְטִימִם*, *Sheptahim*. Used but four times, always in reference to Egypt. Only in the middle books.

30. "Fathers' houses". *Bayith abayith*; sometimes *abayith* alone. Used in Ex. 6:14, 15, which is not P. One verse, Josh. 19:51, is given to P.

31. "Hosts, or armies, of the Israelites". *Tsabaoth*. צבאות. In reference to armed men. It is used by E, Gen. 21:22, 23; by J, Gen. 26:26; by D, Deut. s:19. Since Israel had no army till the exodus, this term is limited to Exodus and Numbers. P controls the middle books. Even then Ex. 6:26 is not P. The reference in D is to the stars as a host.

32. "Congregation" of the Israelites. *Edah*. עדah. Verse cut in two, Num. 13:26. Of this the first half (a) is given to P; but the second half (b), which is JE, has "congregation". Dr. Driver says it is never in JE; he overlooked that instance, and Num. 16:6. Jos. 9:27, also Num. 32:2, 4 are two instances where the section is marked "JE in the main". In Jos. 9:15, and 20:6, Num. 16:2, 20:1, a verse is split in each place in order to give that word to hungry P. In seven other places from one to five verses are cut out for P, who needs this word to form a peculiar style. Consider the five occurrences in JE, and you have a fine example of the way P is found to have a vocabulary all his own. Dr. Driver's mistake, in saying it is not in JE, is easily explained. When he first wrote that, it is probable that those passages were marked P. But a German theory would hardly be German, if it did not turn over before breakfast. Dr. Driver failed to check up with the almanac theory, hence the contradiction. The smile comes in when one reads such reasoning—if it can be called reasoning—and then, "scholarship has settled the question".

33. "Between the two evenings". *Ereb*. Used by H. It occurs only in Ex., Lev., and Num. Dr. Driver says it is a technical expression. With a single exception, it is applied to sacrifices; hence, P has it.

34. "In all your dwellings". *Bakal moshub*. Part of the ritual law. Found only in middle books. H uses it, Lev. 23:3, 14.

35. "This is the thing which Jehovah hath commanded". A legal phrase. Used by H.

36. "A head" (literally skull). *Gulgoleth* גולגלת. Used only in enumerations which are always assigned to P. Found only in Ex. and Num. Only seven times.

37. "To remain over". אֶדָּף, *Adaph*. Only in the middle books. Used by H, Lev. 25:27.

38. "Ruler or prince", among the Israelites. Gen. 34:2, Num. 16:2, Jos. 9:15. Each is a verse cleft to give this word to the voracious P. E uses "the ruler of thy people", Ex. 22:28. JE, "in the main", Num. 32:2, has the word applied to Israelites.

39. "Rulers or princes in the congregation". This is a minute variation from the finical scholarship displayed above. In Num. 16:2 and Jos. 9:15 a verse is divided and the half with this word in it is given to P. Num. 32:2 is JE.

40. "Deep rest". *Sabbathon*. שבתון. Used by H. Always applied to the seventh day or seventh year, it is a part of the ritual law.

41. "According to the command, (lit. mouth,) of Jehovah". Deut. 34:5, a verse split. Used by H, Lev. 24:12; by JE, Jos. 19:50. In Gen. the same phrase, substituting "Pharaoh" for "Jehovah", is used by E.

42. "Half". *Macha tsith*, instead of *mechetsah*, which is the usual word. A selection unfortunate for the theory. It is a ceremonial word, a sacerdotal term. Num. 31 impales the theory. V. 29, 30, 42, 47 use the ceremonial form while V. 36, 43 use the common form. They refer to the half which belonged to the congregation. All are P. If P could vary his usage in order to adapt the word to the subject, why could not Moses? Num. 31 is written by one hand. The modern says it was P. What proof? He uses a priestly word for "half" sometimes. He uses both in this chapter. Subject and occasion decide. Any good writer could do that.

43. "Trespass, commit a trespass". Driver says, "a word belonging to the priestly terminology". Numbers of them do, though he says he does not choose legal terms. Used by H, Lev. 26:40. In Jos. 7:1 a single verse is sliced off for P.

44. The methodical form of superscription. "These are the sons of", "These are the families of". What else could a writer say? No compact synonym can be pointed out. So natural are they that Ex. 6:14, 19, 25, 26 uses this methodical form, though the writer is not P. Notice Jos. 19:48, 51. In each case a verse is amputated, in order that this word may become part of P's style.

45. Dr. Driver seems to think that a large number of ciphers put together will amount to a fraction. They never do. Here he throws in a number of words. (a). "Tribe". *Matteh* oftener than *shebet*. P used both. *Matteh* means a branch. Used accord-

ing to Gesenius, only of the tribes of Israel, it reminds them of their common root. *Shebet* means a rod. J uses it for rod in Ex. 4:2. With the idea of a scepter, then a tribe, it reaches that meaning in Ex. 31:2. As P has the middle books, he employs it frequently. The truth is simple. Moses used *matteh* at first till the Israelite became a host. Then he used *shebet* as a military term. Occasionally the writer returns to *matteh* to recall the common origin of the tribes. Jos. 21 and 22 uses both. H uses *shebet*, Lev. 24:11, which destroys P's patent right. (b). "Beget". A longer grammatical form than usual. It is preferred in formal records. It is more precise. A rhetorical law governs choice. The chosen people have the more stately form. Gen. 25:19, 20, two verses are cut out for P. (c). "Harden the heart". *Chazaq* instead of *Kabed*, to become heavy, which is translated harden. The Hebrew tongue abounds in synonyms. There are five words for "bird"; five for "lion"; eighteen for "end"; ten for "to keep"; ten for "to kill". Some are used but once. "To harden the heart" employs four different words—*amats*, *chazaq*, *kabed*, *qashah*. Dr. Driver makes *chazaq*, peculiar to P; yet E used it, Ex. 4:21, 9:35, 10:20, 27. This was four hundred years before P began. P would have used *kabed* in Ex. 15 if surgical exegesis had not rushed in and cut the verse into two and handed half to J. In Ex. 7:22, one and a half verses given to P save this word for him. In six other places it is only the prompt use of the sharp knife that preserves P's style. With all that, Ex. 9:35 and others are E and *chazaq*. D2 also has it, Jos. 11:20. (d). "To stone", *ragam* instead of *sagah*. Eleven times. Six are in H; one in D, Deut. 21:21; one in JE, Jos. 7:25. According to Hanneman, the more extreme the dilution the mightier the potency of the medicine. This theory must also be homeopathic. There are two instances out of eleven which fairly belong to P. One verse is cut out, Num. 14:10; but Num. 15:35, 36 are the unchallenged property of P. Their strength lies in their weakness. After a term had been public property for two hundred years, P uses it twice, which is proof that a writer called P wrote the ritual law. (e). "To spy". Three words are used—*Raah*, *Rajal*, *Tur*. The last is claimed for P. JE uses it first, Num. 10:33. But P is so determined to use that word, that in Num. 13:17, 21, 15, 32, and 14:6, 7, 38, we have six cuttings. Four verses are deliberately cut into two. D also uses *tur*, Deut. 1:33. (f). "The pronoun I".

Ani, אַנִּי instead of *anoki*, אַנֹכִי, the latter but once, the former 130 times. D uses the short form (Deut. 22:49, 52), and P employs the longer (Gen. 23:4).

46. Geographical names. Kirjath-arba. This is another name for Hebron, as it is called by J, and JE. In Jos. 14:15, Kirjath-arba is JE. In the Hebrew it is Kirjath-sepher. Sepher means "book". A city of books. Kirjath means "city". P is not the only one who knew it.

47. Machpelah. This is secured for P by the vivisectional process. Gen. 50:12-13 are thus torn out with this word in them. Had it not been for that, J would have used the word.

48. PadanAram. Again the text bleeds. Gen. 31:18, 33:18, a verse pulled apart in each case. Gen. 25:20, two verses; 35:9, five verses cut.

49. The desert of Zin. There is no sin in this except Num. 20:1, a verse is torn into twain to give one-half to P. Num. 13:21 a verse is chopped out for the rapacious P.

50. The Steppes of Moab. The Plains of Moab. Used by JE, Deut. 34:1. One verse given to P, Num. 22:1.

The result of the examination lies close to zero.

No. 1 violates rule one, a verse cut into two.

No. 2 violates rule three, word used by another writer.

No. 3 violates rule one.

No. 4 violates rule three.

No. 5 violates rules one and three.

No. 6 violates rule three.

No. 7 violates rules one and three.

No. 8 violates rules one and three.

No. 9 violates rule one.

No. 10 violates in (a) rule three, (b) a valid instance.

No. 11 violates rule one.

No. 12 violates rule three.

No. 13 violates rules one and three.

No. 14 violates rule three.

No. 15 violates rule three.

No. 16 violates rule one.

No. 17 violates rules one and three.

No. 18 violates rule one.

No. 19 violates rule three.

No. 20 violates rule three.

- No. 21 violates (a) rule one, (b) rule three.
- No. 22 violates rules one and three.
- No. 23 violates rule one.
- No. 24 violates rule three.
- No. 25 violates (a) rule three, (b) rule three.
- No. 26 violates rule three.
- No. 27 violates rule three.
- No. 28 violates rules one three.
- No. 29 violates rule two, a technical term.
- No. 30 violates rule three.
- No. 31 violates rule two.
- No. 32 violates rules one and three.
- No. 33 violates rules two and three.
- No. 34 violates rules two and three.
- No. 35 violates rules two and three.
- No. 36 violates rule two.
- No. 37 violates rules two and three.
- No. 38 violates rules one and three.
- No. 39 violates rules one and three.
- No. 40 violates rules two and three.
- No. 41 violates rules one and three.
- No. 42 violates rule two.
- No. 43 violates rules one and two.
- No. 44 violates rules one and three, (b) valid.
- No. 45 (a) violates rule three, (b) rule one.
 - (c) violates rules one and three.
 - (d) violates rules one and three.
 - (e) violates rules one and three.
 - (f) violates rule three.
- No. 46 violates rule one.
- No. 47 violates rule one.
- No. 48 violates rule one.
- No. 49 violates rule one.
- No. 50 violates rules three and one.

Only 10 (b) passes examination. "Thy seed after thee". It is given to P by the excision of five verses in two places (Gen. 35:12 and 48:4). It occurs in that form only five times in the Hexateuch. Since there are fifty words or phrases submitted, and this is (b), it gives to the analysis out of a possible one hundred just one per cent. Kirjath Arba occurs six times—all

P, except once it is JE. In that instance it is Kirjath-sepher in the Hebrew (sepher means book), so it may be fairly given to P. It is another name for Hebron. Adding this to the list, a word which is found on an average once in each book, we have three per cent. out of a possible one hundred. This the sole proof of the existence of P. *Sic transit gloria*, P. Style and diction fled. He never had any body or skeleton—nothing but clothes. With these stripped off as stolen goods, nothing remains for the funeral. Dr. Driver would fain lay a sprig of rosemary on the bier, but it has vanished. Dr. Moore of Andover then explains that P never was an individual, anyhow. Whereupon Dr. Driver admits that P was not truthful; “It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the representation of P includes elements not, in the ordinary sense of the term, historical.” Int., p. 128.

NOTE F.—DR. BRIGGS'S LINGUISTIC ARGUMENT.

Dr. Briggs has (Hexateuch, p. 69f) a list of thirty words. The purpose is not clear. They begin in the desert and go nowhere. All that could be deduced from them is that, after the Pentateuch is cut up among several writers, some will have some words which others may not have. That would not be surprising. Nor would it be of any value. To show how unscholarly this theory can be, the list has some interest. Some omitted words we have examined under P:

“1. The month Abib is used in J, E, D, Ex. xiii:4, xxiii:15, xxxv:18; Deut xvi:1; but not in P, which uses, instead, ‘the first month’. Ex. xii:2, 18, xi:2, 17; Lev. xxiii:5; Num. ix:1, xxviii:6, xxxiii:3; for which Nisan in Neh. ii:1; Esth. ii:7.”

Seeing that these two last-named books of the exile use Nisan, why did not P also?

Ahib is not used outside of Exodus and Deuteronomy. Then only in four verses. It is not strange that it is not found in P. When a day of the month is to be named, then the “first month” is used. Abib is named, Ex. 12:2, because it was made the first month of the sacred year. A rule of the analysis is to assign numbers to P. If it were not for this rule, J could use the term “the first month”. Gen. 8:13 is divided—one half to P, the other to J. By thus taking a half verse from a J context, this brilliant scholarship can sagely remark that P always uses “the first month”, while J employs Abib. Num. 10:2 is cut to prevent J

having that half of a verse, which would destroy the usage of P. In Jos. 4:19 one verse is taken out for P's benefit, who has not been heard of for three chapters. But that verse has "the first month" in it; hence, is scissored out for P. If stalwart men did not condescend to such surgical exegesis it would be called silly. No other book is thus humiliated and brought to speak nonsense.

In further examination we shall not waste the readers' time with such detail but will condense our notes.

"2. אִדְמָה, *adamah* is a characteristic word of J. P uses אֵרֶץ *erets* instead. J uses *erets*, Gen. 2:5, 6, 11, 12, 13; 4:12, 14, 16; 6:4, 5, 6. P uses *adamah* Gen. 1:25; 6:20; 9:2; Gen. 5 is P, except one verse. That verse has *adamah* and is given to J. Dr. Briggs sees these places where P employs *adamah*, but says it has a different meaning. J uses *adamah* in Gen. 2:5, 6, 7, 9, 19, which can be compared with P, as cited above.

"4. אָמָה *amah*, handmaid, is used by E, H, D, for which שִׁפְחָה *shipchah* is used by J and P. The words have totally different meanings. אָמָה *amah* is a concubine, *shipchah* is a female servant. Thus E uses *amah* in Gen. 20:17 for the concubines of Abimelech, and in V. 14 uses *shipchah* for the female servants given to Abraham. The writer of the Pentateuch was a better Hebraist than Dr. Briggs.

"5. אָמֵנָה *omnah* and אֱמֵנָם *omnam*, verily, are used by J and E, for which D and P use אָמֵן *amen*.

The words are quite distinct. The last we have transferred, it is "amen". It is used after another has spoken. "Its proper place is where one person confirms the words of another and expresses a wish for the issue of his vows or predictions: *fiat, ita sit*: Amen, so be it, LXX, well *genoto*" (Gesenius).

The only place where *omnah* is used in the Pentateuch is Gen. 20:12. Dr. Briggs's idea seems to be that if D or P had written that, it would be "She is Amen my sister", instead of "She is indeed my sister". A similar rule would have the two places where *omnam* is employed in the Pentateuch to read, Shall I Amen bear a child, and, Am I not Amen able to promote thee? (Gen. 18:13, Num. 22:37). Then P uses Amen only in one verse, Num. 5:22, and D uses it in only one chapter (Deut. 27). From such fancies the conservative, adopting the Episcopal form, and we fear without due reverence, prays, "Good Lord deliver us".

"6. Amorite for the general name of the population of Pales-

tine, is used by E while J prefers Canaanite. E never uses Canaanite". In Ex. 23:28 and 33:2 E uses Canaanite without sending his compliments to the theory. Then J, equally unfeeling, uses Amorite and Canaanite in the same passage as though he knew more of the ethnology of Palestine than we do, Ex. 3:8-17. J or JE and E also use both words in the same verse, Ex. 13:5 and 23:23. Each tribe was prominent in the land.

8. A single instance. Used but once in the Pentateuch. What difference can that make to whom it may be assigned. It is given to E.

"9. *בַּא* *baal*, owner, husband, lord, and as noun of relation, and Baal the Canaanitish god, is often used by E and D, but never used by J, H, P."

The only case where Baal is used in the Pentateuch is Num. 22:41. That is JE. Also in Josh. 13:17. The latter is P in contradiction to Dr. Briggs's idea. The name is hidden in places, but that is its etymology. It is not used by E or D—a flat denial of Dr. Briggs's scholarship.

The word "baal" was harmless at first, meaning "master". It is applied to the owner of an ox, the husband of a wife, and in many ways. It is hidden in combination with other words, possibly escaping the Hebrew vision of Dr. Briggs. It first appears in Gen. 14:13 in the word translated "confederate", literally "lords of a covenant". This chapter is too huge for the critics to assign easily. Dr. Driver jumps the difficulty. Knobel and Delitzsch give it to J. Gen. 49:23, it masquerades under "archers", the "masters of arrows". This is J, and destroys Dr. Briggs's classification. So his keen-eyed scholarship ought to have revealed it to Dr. Briggs in Num. 21:28, used by JE; Lev. 21:4 used by H; and Jos. 13:17, by P, which render his assertion devoid of factual foundation.

"10. *בַּעַר* *Baar*, to be brutish, twice in E and *בֵּיר* *beir* brute; 5 times in E; not elsewhere in the Pentateuch".

Much learning hath made Dr. Briggs queer. The first word does not usually mean to be brutish; it took that turn in the hands of Isaiah and Jeremiah, but its meaning is far removed from that in the Pentateuch. It is a verb and means to burn; a single exception is to be noticed, Ex. 22:5, where it is applied to the grass consumed by cattle.

Nowhere in the Scriptures under review is it translated "brutish", nor would it be suitable. Dr. Briggs gives it twice in

E. He must have limited it to one form of the verb. Even then his statement is wild. The verb is found in the

Kal perfect, Num. 11:3, it is JE.

Kal future, Ex. 3:3, it is E.

Kal future, Num. 11:1, it is JE.

Kal participle, Ex. 3:02, it is E.

Kal participle, Deut. 4:11, it is D.

Kal participle, Deut. 5:23, it is D.

Kal participle, Deut. 9:15, it is D.

Piel perfect, Ex. 22:5, it is E.

Piel perfect, Lev. 6:12, it is P.

Piel perfect, Deut. 13:5, it is D.

The usage in Deuteronomy is invariably to put away or remove piel, perfect or future. It occurs thirteen times with this meaning:

Piel infinitive, "to be wasted", Num. 24:2, it is JE.

Piel future, "to kindle", Ex. 35:3, it is P.

Hiphil future, a field "to be eaten", Ex. 22:5, it is E.

Hiphil participle, "to be kindled", Ex. 22:6, it is E.

The translation "to be brutish" is found only in Niphal, a form which does not appear, in this verb, in the Hexateuch. When used long after Moses it is by few and but seldom. It retains the first meaning of "to burn" until Malachi's day. Dr. Briggs's saying is exceedingly vulnerable. He has the verb twice in E. It is found five times. He puts it not elsewhere in the Hexateuch. It is there more than twenty times which he did not count. He limits it to E. It is used by D, JE, and P.

The noun he has five times used by E. It is never translated "brute", either in the A. V. or Revised. It would be a coarse, rough translation in any case—*e. g.*, "Lade your brutes and go"; "we should die, we and our brutes"; "the congregation drank and their brutes".

Instead of the five instances being all E, as Dr. Briggs thought, three of them, Num. 20:4, 8, 11, are P. One explanation partially explains such careless writing. It is that from 1897 till 1898 was long enough for a theory in opposition to the Bible to make numerous readjustments, so the analysis was very different the next year, when Dr. Driver published the analysis which Dr. Briggs endorsed, and by which he is tried.

"11. בָּשָׂר. *Basar*, in the meaning of body, is only in P of the

Hexateuch; elsewhere in Ecclesiastes and in poetry." Another example of the profound erudition on which the hypothesis floats. The word is, with one exception, never translated "body." That one exception is in Isaiah. Ecclesiastes (Revised) has it "flesh" every time, while Proverbs distinguishes it from body, שֶׁרֶץ, *sheer*. It is used in the Pentateuch about 150 times. In a very few instances it is translated "kin", otherwise "flesh". J, E, P, D, all use it. "Not elsewhere in the Hexateuch". The word does not occur in Joshua.

"12. גָּרַשׁ, *garash*, to drive out, in JE, not elsewhere in the Hexateuch." There are passages marked J and also E, but Num. 22:6, 11, Deut. 33:27 are JE; Lev. 21:7 is H; Num. 30:10 is P.

"13. דִּבְרֵאֵת *dabar eth* speak with. Used by P, E, D, but not by J." But J uses *eth* with other verbs.

"Then דִּבְרֵם *dabar in* used by J, D, E, not by P". We find different prepositions used with *dabar*. *dabar el* is not noticed by Dr. Briggs. It unites the two lonely letters, for J employs it in Gen. 19:14 and P in Gen. 8:15. Dr. Driver did not think it worth quoting in favor of P.

"14. דְּמוּת *demuth* likeness, is used in P and in Ezekiel" and also elsewhere. It is found but three times in the entire Hexateuch, then only in two chapters in Genesis.

"15. דֶּרֶר *deror*, only in P". True, but it occurs but twice; then it is in the ritual, so P takes it.

"16. דֹּר דֹּר *dor dor*, 'generations' used only in E". Only two instances in the Hexateuch.

"17. דָּן *dan*, 'judge' only in E" but only four times in the Hexateuch. Even then, Gen. 30:6, is one verse cut out from J and given to E.

"18. חָזַק *chazah* 'behold' is only in E in the Hexateuch". Only once is it E. Ex. 18:21; Ex. 24:11 is J; Num. 24:4, 16 are JE.

19. חַטָּאָה *Chataah* 'sin'. (Not the customary word). It is found four times in the Pentateuch. Dr. Briggs gives one to E and three to J. Another example of rapid change of the analysis. Those three, Ex. 32:21, 30, 31, are all E with Dr. Driver and us who are up-to-date, on the theory.

"20. עוֹרָחַי 'Yet alive', Found in J, E, D; not in H or P". True. What does it prove? Three writers use it; the others did not have occasion to express that thought.

"22. יָרָה *Yarah* 'cast', 'throw', 'shoot'. Only in JE; but as

Hiphil, 'to teach', in all the documents". There are six occurrences divided J and E except two given to JE.

23. מוֹת וְיָמוֹת *muth yamuth*, "be put to a violent death, capital punishment, used by E, H, P". Dr. Briggs sees three distinct usages of the verb in connection with the death penalty, which characterize three distinct layers of the Hexateuch. His reasoning is muddy, or so gauzy, or we are so dumb, that it is hardly intelligible but it can be disproved. For in Hophal it is found in E, P, H, and J. Which layer does that characterize?

Kal, "future", is found in E, P, and J. Which layer does that mark? Hiphil, which gives him his third layer, does not furnish one example from the Hexateuch. Yet he might have quoted Gen. 38:7, 42:37, Num. 35:19. Why did he not cite these? Because it is not healthy. The first is J, the second E, the third is P. The verb alone without the intensive infinite absolute is in all his imaginary codes and elsewhere. With that form it again traverses his theory.

When a hypothesis is so ill as to need such heroic assertions, which are so careless as to facts, no literary hospital can save it.

"25. מְלָאכָה *melakah*. Used for business, occupation by J; meaning property by E and J; work by P and E and D". To this add Gen. 39:11, which Gesenius says means Joseph's prescribed work. That is J.

"26. נִשְׁמָה *neshamah* 'breath', J and D; also every living thing". Found six times. Two are J and four are D, says Dr. Briggs. He is nearly right. Had he telephoned us we could have told him "Two J, one D, and three D2". That would have brought him up to date. Two verses are cut out of Gen. 7 to give 'breath' to J.

"28. עָבַד *tsaba* 'serve' three times in P, not elsewhere in Hexateuch. *Tsaba* (different vowel points), 'war', thirteen times in P. *Yats tsaba*, fifteen times in P, five in Chronicles. 'Service' P eight times, D twice. 'Army', 'host' forty-seven times in P, twice E, twice J. Of 'heavenly bodies' twice P4; of the entire creation once P". This is all he says. If any one can tell what the good doctor is trying to prove he has the advantage.

Cartloads of that kind of literature could be dug out of either the Hebrew or the Greek but *cui bono*? Dr. Briggs does not tell. The alleged writers, except H, use these words; if the subject had demanded it, they could have used them oftener or with various shades of meaning. There is no law against it.

"29. The mount of law giving is called Horeb in E and D, but Sinai in J and P". But few languages have as many synonyms as the Hebrew. The range may have had the name Horeb, the peak Sinai.

"30. E uses a large number of archaic words". Dr. Driver does not think so. He says there is no perceptible archaic flavor in JE. Then Dr. Briggs submits eight. Of these one is J, two are now JE.

DR. BRIGGS' BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

One of the most pathetic incidents in the history of the contending theories arises from the innocence of Dr. Briggs, who supposed that the conjectures could be reduced to a system.

Accordingly he ventured on some biblical theology. The value depends entirely on the analysis remaining the same. After nearly 150 years good Dr. Briggs supposed it would stand still for a few years. Vain hope. His "Hexateuch" edition of 1897, was followed the next year by a new edition of Driver's Introduction. Both from Scribner's. Dr. Briggs says the various analyses of several critics are agreed. Then his theology is bankrupt.

Briggs, 1897, p. 147ff.

Driver, 1898.

Ex. 14:16 was E.	The next year it is P.
Ex. 15:25 was E.	The next year it is J.
Num. 21:8, 9 was E.	The next year it is JE.
Josh. 6:5 was E.	The next year it is JE.
Ex. 8:15 was P.	The next year it is half J and half P.
(Further it does not refer to the subject quoted.)	
Ex. 8:17-19 was J.	The next year it is P.
Josh. 3:15-17 was J.	The next year it is JE.
Ex. 8:1-3 was P.	The next year it is J.
Ex. 8:12, 13 was P.	The next year it is J.
Num. 20:8-17 was P.	The next year it is JE.

On page 74 the confiding doctor quotes some archaic phrases of E. But

Num. 20:21 changed to JE.

Num. 22:13, 14 changed to JE.

Ex. 3:19 changed to P.

To show how the fluctuations upset theology, follow Dr. Briggs: "The miracles of J were wrought without any instruments".

But the next year Ex. 4:2-9 have become J. There the rod of Moses and the water of the Nile are both used.

"The miracles of J were wrought . . . without human mediation. That was true in 1897, but in 1898, Ex. 4. Ex. 4:1-9 are J, where God sends Moses as his mediator to work miracles. That is with human mediation. So it is also in Ex. 8:17-19. This is J, and Aaron is the mediator by whom God works miracles.

Other examples could be quoted, but this is sufficient. The brethren speak largely in the future; they are always hopeful that some time they will be about to bring out a biblical theology which will remove theories that have made the Bible incapable of intelligent apprehension. Dr. Briggs was too previous.

Dr. Driver could not even agree with himself. He has an argument which demands a certain assignment of J, E, P, etc., but the analysis needs them in a different way. Both stand. In the same book, same edition. Few theories can be so elastic. No wonder its devotees admire it every day and sometimes on Sunday.

NOTE H.—THE LAW IN THE PROPHETS.

Stanley Leathes, professor of Hebrew in King's College, London, published in 1891 a monograph of 187 pages giving the allusions to and implications of the law in the prophets. It has been neatly ignored. He found—

In Isaiah	240
In Jeremiah	200
In Lamentations	18
In Hosea	80
In Amos	50
In Joel	30
In Nahum	10
In Zephaniah	20
In Habakkuk	14

662

Ezekiel	180
In Daniel	16
In Obadiah	4

300

In Haggai	7
In Zechariah	30
In Malachi.....	15
	<hr/> 52

The first list were before the exile, the middle trio were in the captivity, the last were during and after the reiteration.

The larger number, even with the different length considered, is found before the destruction of Jerusalem.

Stronger proof of the existence of the law could not be given. They quote from all parts of the Pentateuch. If D and P were not written till the times assigned, these quotations would be in very bad taste to say the least. For it is not customary among scholars to quote from a man centuries before he lives.

Prof. Robertson found in Hosea and Amos allusions which cover the history of the exodus, the adoption of Israel, the making of a covenant, and the giving of a written law.

Amos refers to laws written in P 400 years before P lived. Another remarkable feat of memory or rather of anticipation.

NOTE I.—THE RETREAT OF MODERN SCHOLARSHIP.

W. Robertson Smith wrote:† “I know of no attempt on the part of apologists for tradition to meet directly the historical arguments that establish the doctrine of modern criticism, the late date of the priests’ code, ‘The traditional argument’ is admittedly theological rather than historical. They appeal to the authority of the New Testament or . . . urge that it is incredible that God in his providence should have allowed his church to hold and teach for so many centuries an opinion concerning the origin of Israel’s sacred institutions which is not historically correct.”

There may have been conservative writers who took the position here assigned them, but eighteen years have passed since we first read Prof. Smith’s lectures and in all that time we have never met nor heard of one so weak.

Prof. Smith has no reason to regret the failure of able men to meet him. Prof. W. H. Green published an article in the Presbyterian Review in 1882. Then in 1883 he published “Moses and the Prophets” which was all that Prof. Smith could ask and

†O. T. in the Jewish Church,—421-22.

something over. Prof. Green not only was conservative he was progressive as well. The works of every theological writer of repute was on his wide shelves, he surveyed the question from every side. He received honors from a dozen universities. America, Scotland, Germany, Switzerland and Finland thus recognized his scholarship and ability. He met Prof. Smith's arguments fully and strongly.

Prof. Watts of London, also wrote on that theme in answer to Prof. Smith, "The Newer Criticism and the Analogy of Faith". He paid respectful and forcible attention to Prof. Smith's lectures.

In 1894 fourteen scholarly men of Great Britain published the "Lex Mosaica". It contains over 600 pages. All is devoted to the historical argument, except the first article, by Prof. Sayce, which is archæological, a first cousin of the historical argument. Those men had published similar articles in the periodical press.

The Speaker's Commentary was issued several years before Prof. Smith issued his lectures. It discussed the question, advanced the historical argument, met objections without using a single argument assigned to the conservative side by Prof. Smith.

When Prof. Smith issued his second edition in 1892 he paid no attention at all to the overwhelming arguments of professors Green and Watts, to say nothing of other writers.

Dr. Driver walks that same ignoble path.

Another canon in the Church of England is R. B. Girdlestone. Whether as a canon he is equal to Canon Driver or not we can not say. As an author he is scholarly, courteous, and forcible. Canon Driver dismisses him with a sneer at his inexact knowledge. We shall see Driver doing this where his knowledge is not as great as that of the man he criticises.

Why should Girdlestone be named only to insult him? Not a line is quoted from Girdlestone to prove that his knowledge is inexact. That is merely Dr. Driver's assertion. Each has issued a commentary on Deuteronomy. In that Girdlestone is certainly more exact.

The Speaker's Com. was suggested by the Speaker of the House, the Right Hon. J. Evelyn Denison. The best scholars in the Established Church were appointed to write it. They were, specialists. The Archbishop of York and the Regius Professors of Divinity in Cambridge and Oxford were the committee of appeal in case of disagreement.

F. C. Cook, canon of Exeter was editor. So cautious is he that he begins with the proposition "Moses could have written the Pentateuch". He devotes a number of pages to the examination of Egyptian words used in the Pentateuch. Egypt had changed greatly in the thousand years from Moses to P. Words used in the early days of Egyptian supremacy were obsolete in the days when her power was broken, her supremacy forever gone. The words of common use, ortechanical words would not be in the knowledge of a man living in Babylon in the time of the exile. Canon Cook carefully walks with an archaeologist, every step along that difficult path. He shares his discoveries with any patient reader for he gives the Egyptian hieroglyphs and the Hebrew transcription, and the English equivalent. Some forty words reward his search. They are irreconcilable with the theory.

In science when a theory clashes with indubitable facts, that ends it. The scientist who yet stands by it is left behind. The true scientist tests and rejects numerous theories, until he finds one which meets every fact. An investigator may either follow the man who has found a flaw in his theory or he may abuse him. Canon Driver unfortunately takes the latter course. Eight times he names the Speaker's Com. Every time he scoffs at it. Never does he cite a statement and show its falsity or mistake. It is simply denunciation. The case quoted is decisive. If Prof. Sayce had said of the list of Egyptian words given by the Speaker's that it is "inaccurate and misleading" we must accept unless some other archaeologist challenge Prof. Sayce's opinion. But Dr. Driver is not an archaeologist. He knows no more than Canon Cook, probably not as much. For Cook quotes a French archaeologist who afterward published the same things, unaware of Cook's work. So Driver's "very inaccurate and misleading" has no critical authority behind it. For all we can see it is a reckless statement destitute of any factual foundation. Not an expert, without an argument he drags in other writers to sneer at their work.

He has the temerity to dispose of an American, whose argument he cannot answer in the same cheap way.

The new school reasons that "beyond Jordan" of Deuteronomy 1:5 means eastern Palestine, therefore the writer was in Western Palestine. He who reads the context will conclude that argu-

ment is not the *forte* of the new school. Prof. E. C. Bissell of Hartford Theological Sem. after thirty years study, collected a number of review articles which he had written and published them under the title: "The Pentateuch Its Origin and Structure". On P, 270 he says regarding this phrase: "The words mean, taken by themselves, 'at the crossing of the Jordan'. Used alone they point neither to the east or the west side. Just what is meant in any given instance is a matter which can be determined only by the context. The writer of this book (Dt.) in fact employs the work in the very same passage, intelligibly and with clear intention to mean now the east and again the west side of the Jordan. (3:8, 20).

"Conscious of the ambiguity of the phrase, he uses it in no single case where misunderstanding might arise that he has not guarded against it. He says: 'On this side Jordan in the plain over against the Red Sea', or "on this side Jordan in the land of Moab", or "toward the sunrising", or 'by the way the sun goeth down'. Every one of the ten is thus rigorously insured against the possibility of error by means of an added explanation, excepting one (3:20) which does not need it. How absurd, in these circumstances, the ado that has been made and continues to be made over these words by critics, learned and unlearned, who seem never to have thoroughly examined the connection in which they stand. We submit that it is not the writer of Deuteronomy who betrays himself, but the objector who puts a quibble in the place of reason."

Two years after the words quoted above were published Dr. Driver, with Bissell's criticism before him, wrote: †"The use of the phrase 'beyond Jordan' for Eastern Palestine in 1:5, 3:8, 4:41, 46f, 49, exactly as in Josh. 2:10, 7:7, 9:10, etc., Jud. 5:17, 19:8, implies that the author was a resident in Western Palestine (the same usage, implying the same fact, in Num. 22:1, 34:15)."

The reader will note that the student of Dr. Driver would be led to think that the learned author had given all the passages, that it was a fair deduction.

1. Every example he cites is flanked by other words which show that Eastern Palestine is meant.

2. The occurrences to which Dr. Driver is judiciously blind

†Dr Driver. Introduction, p. 84.

show just as conclusively that "beyond Jordan" means Western Palestine. A partisan could use them in that way.

3. Compare the two men in dignity of treatment, in force of argument, in depth of scholarship. Dr. Bissell gives every one of the ten instances.

Is it not true that in practical life a narrow theory sometimes drives men to unmanly and reprehensible conduct? Does not a theory dwarf men and despotically compel shifts which a high-toned scholarship would despise? When there was no necessity for it Dr. Driver takes occasion to lampoon Dr. Bissell, saying of his *Pentateuch*: "The author is singularly unable to distinguish between a good argument and a poor one." (*Int.*, p. 158). Which has the argument on the Jordan? Other examples of this same spirit could be cited. We blame it on the smallness of the theory.

The unhappy literary habits engendered by the defense of the new theory are in evidence. The intellectual resources of the men are large; the intellectual possessions of this theory of negation and of retrogression are meagre. Unbelief is always thin. It is congenitally poor. When Christian scholars adopt the position as to the *Pentateuch* held by Celsus, Hobbes, Spinoza, Voltaire, Kuenen, Wellhausen, and others who deny any revelation to Israel, the paucity of argument is painfully evident in the sad shifts illustrated by these able men. Since only a small number accept the new view, the advocates are impelled to assume superiority to the rest of mankind. Hence, the unfounded and unjust claim to the possession of the field of scholarship. They also deny the power of the popular mind to judge of the question, which is unmanly and an evidence of defeat. The highest truths that ever came from heaven can be judged and appreciated by the popular mind when they secure a voice capable of bringing them to the range of the popular vocabulary.

A man does not need to be a tailor in order to tell whether his coat fits or not. He does not require the training of a politician in order to judge of a measure of public weal. Nor is it necessary that he should be a professor of theology in order to judge of arguments. Yet, not only in religion, the advocates of a narrow and jejune theory will shove you off the earth, if you permit it, by the amplitude of their assumed knowledge. They are compelled to that by the paucity of resources. Would not

Dr. Driver have taken pleasure in submitting a weak argument from Girdlestone or the Speaker's Commentary or Bissell, and exposing its mistake, if he could have done so? There is no man engaged in advocating that which he believes to be truth, and for the good of the race, who is not ready to expose the weakness of error. It is right. With all respect toward men, the error may be smitten hip and thigh. It is a contest between the truth which saves and the error which dooms to sorrow. It is with regret that we behold a man of such gifts as W. Robertson Smith or S. R. Driver constrained to the partisan advocacy of a theory which proves its narrowness and ultra-conservatism by the devices substituted for arguments and the unkind treatment of opposing arguments. It is a bar to progress. Its adoption would be a backward step in scientific investigation and in theology. It leads to a narrow and unworthy partisanship and to superciliousness.

NOTE K.—LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH.

HEBREW.	REFERENCE.	ENGLISH.
שָׂרָץ	Gen. 1:20	Creeping thing
בִּדְלוֹחַ	Gen. 2:12	Bdellium
פֶּנֶא	Gen. 3:3	Lest
בֶּחֳבֹן	Gen. 3:4	Belly
הָרֹנֶה	Gen. 3:16	Conception
זְעֵה	Gen. 3:19	Sweat
לֹהֵט	Gen. 3:24	Flaming
חֹרֵשׁ	Gen. 4:22	Artificer
דָּוָה	Gen. 6:3	Strive
נְפִילִים	Gen. 6:4	Giants
נִפְרֹ	Gen. 6:4	Gopher
יֶקוֹם	Gen. 7:4	Living substance
טָרַף	Gen. 8:11	Pluckt off
מִכְסֵה	Gen. 8:13	Covering
חִמְרִי	Gen. 11:3	Slime
זֶלֶד	Gen. 11:30	Child

NOTE K—LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH—*Continued*

HEBREW.	REFERENCE.	ENGLISH.
רָכֶשׂ	Gen. 12:5.	They had gathered
חָנִיךְ	Gen. 14:14.	Trained
מִשְׁקָן	Gen. 15:2.	Steward
נוֹלָךְ	Gen. 15:9.	Young pigeon
בָּתַר	Gen. 15:10.	Divide
עֲדֻנָּה	Gen. 18:12.	Pleasant
כַּבְשֵׁן	Gen. 19:28.	Furnace
הַפְכָּה	Gen. 19:29.	Overthrow
אִמְנָה	Gen. 20:12.	Indeed
זָקֵנִים	Gen. 21:2.	Old age
טַחֵחַ	Gen. 21:16.	Bowshot
קֶשֶׁת	Gen. 21:20.	Archer
עָקַר	Gen. 22:9.	Bound
שִׁקְמָה	Gen. 24:20.	Trough
בַּקַּע	Gen. 24:22.	Half a shekel.
יָשָׁם	Gen. 24:33.	Was set.
זֶה	Gen. 24:65.	This (pronoun).
צִעִיף	Gen. 24:65.	A vail.
לַעֲמֵךְ	Gen. 25:30.	Feed me.
שִׁפּוֹר	Gen. 26:12.	(An hundred) fold.
עִשְׂקָה	Gen. 26:20.	Strove.
מָרָה	Gen. 26:35.	Grief.
תֵּלִי	Gen. 27:3.	Thy quiver
נִטְעָמִים	Gen. 27:4.	Savory meat
גִּבּוֹר	Gen. 27:29.	Lord
מִלָּה	Gen. 28:12.	Ladder
נִפְכָּתוּלִים	Gen. 30:8.	Wrestlings
כִּשּׁוֹר	Gen. 30:13.	Happiness
זָבַד	Gen. 30:20.	Endue
זָבַל	Gen. 30:20.	Will dwell

NOTE K.—LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH—*Continued.*

HEBREW.	REFERENCE.	ENGLISH.
נקד	Gen. 30:32	Speckled
מחשף	Gen. 30:37	Appear
חום	Gen. 30:32	Brown
בשב	Gen. 30:32	Among the sheep
לזן	Gen. 30:37	Hazel
פצלות	Gen. 30:37	Strakes
פצל	Gen. 30:38	Had pilled
מנית	Gen. 31:37	Times
אבק	Gen. 32:25	Wrestled
נשה	Gen. 32:32	Which shrank
אטי	Gen. 33:14	Safety
חתה	Gen. 35:5	Terror
ימם	Gen. 36:24	Mules
לט	Gen. 37:25	Myrrh
חתמת	Gen. 38:25	Signet
סדור	Gen. 39:20	Prison
בתרזן	Gen. 40:5	According to interpretation
בתר	Gen. 40:16	Interpretation
חרי	Gen. 40:16	White
שדף	Gen. 41:6	Blasted
רק	Gen. 41:9	Lean in flesh
צנם	Gen. 41:23	Withered
פקדון	Gen. 41:36	For store
אסון	Gen. 42:4	Mischief
כנים	Gen. 42:11	True
אמחת	Gen. 42:27	Sack
במנים	Gen. 43:11	Nuts
משנה	Gen. 43:12	Oversight
צעידה	Gen. 43:33	His youth
טענ	Gen. 45:17	Lade

NOTE K —LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH—*Continued*

HEBREW.	REFERENCE.	ENGLISH.
זקן	Gen. 48:10.....	Age
דגה	Gen. 48:16.....	Grow
פחן	Gen. 49:4.....	Unstable
מכרה	Gen. 49:5.....	Habitations
שוקה	Gen. 49:11.....	Unto the choice vine
לבן	Gen. 49:12.....	White
חכלילי	Gen. 49:12.....	Red
שפיבן	Gen. 49:17.....	An adder
שפן	Gen. 49:21.....	Goodly
בבית	Gen. 50:4.....	Mourning
שליש	Gen. 50:23.....	The third
חיה	Ex. 1:19.....	Lively
לבה	Ex. 3:2.....	Flame
פקח	Ex. 4:11.....	Seeing
מולת	Ex. 4:26.....	Circumcision
סבלה	Ex. 6:6-7.....	Burdens
קצר	Ex. 6:9.....	Anguish
דודה	Ex. 6:20.....	Father's Sister
להטים	Ex. 7:11.....	Enchantments
משארת	Ex. 8:3.....	Kneading troughs
כנם	Ex. 8:17.....	Lice
פיה	Ex. 9:8.....	Ashes
אבעפער	Ex. 9:9-10.....	Blains
נבעיל	Ex. 9:31.....	Bolled
אפילת	Ex. 9:32.....	Not grown up
כסם	Ex. 12:4.....	Make count
מכסה	Ex. 12:4.....	By number
משקיף	Ex. 12:7.....	Upper door post
בשל	Ex. 12:9.....	Boiled
נא	Ex. 12:9.....	Raw

NOTE K.—LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH—*Continued.*

HEBREW.	REFERENCE.	ENGLISH.
שָׁמַיִם	Ex. 12:15	Leaven
שְׂפוּדִים	Ex. 12:42	Much observed
שָׁנָה	Ex. 13:12	That cometh
טוֹטְפוֹת	Ex. 13:16	Frontlets
כִּבְדָּה	Ex. 14:25	Heavily
עוֹדֵם	Ex. 15:8	Gathered together
צָלָה	Ex. 15:10	They sank
חֶסֶם	Ex. 16:4	Round thing
תְּלִילוֹת	Ex. 16:7	Murmurings
שִׁכְבָּה	Ex. 16:13	Lay
שִׁבְתוֹן	Ex. 16:23	Rest
צִפְיֹת	Ex. 16:31	Wafers
גִּד	Ex. 16:31	Coriander
צִנְצִנָּה	Ex. 16:33	Pot
כִּסֵּי	Ex. 17:16	Throne
קִנְאָה	Ex. 20:5	Jealous
רָצַע	Ex. 21:6	Shall bore
מִרְצֵעַ	Ex. 21:6	Aul
כּוֹיָה	Ex. 21:25	Burning
נָגַח	Ex. 21:29	Wont to push
גְּנֵבָה	Ex. 22:3	Theft
מַהֲרֵה	Ex. 22:16	Surely
מִלְאָה	Ex. 22:29	Ripe fruits
דֹמֵעַ	Ex. 22:29	Liquors
זָכוֹר	Ex. 23:17	Male
צִרְעָה	Ex. 25:28	Hornets
טָהוֹר	Ex. 24:10	Clearness
לִפְנֵה	Ex. 24:10	Paved
תַּחֲשֵׁ	Ex. 15:5	Badgers
מִשְׁחָה	Ex. 22:5	Anointing

NOTE K—LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH—*Continued*

HEBREW.	REFERENCE.	ENGLISH.
חֶשֶׁן	Ex. 25:7.....	Breastplate
קֶרֶן	Ex. 22:11.....	Crown
קֶרֶה	Ex. 25:29.....	Dishes
שָׁקָר	Ex. 4:26.....	Like unto almonds
מִלְקָחִים	Ex. 25:38.....	Tongs
שָׁוֶר	Ex. 26:1.....	Twined
חִבְרָת	Ex. 26:4.....	Coupling
מַחְבֵּרֶת	Ex. 26:4.....	Coupling
קִיצוֹן	Ex. 26:4.....	Uttermost
קֶרְסִים	Ex. 26:6.....	Taches
סֶדֶחַ	Ex. 26:12.....	Remnant
שֶׁלֶב	Ex. 26:17.....	Set in order
מִקְצֵעַת	Ex. 26:23.....	Corners
תָּמִים	Ex. 26:24.....	Coupled together
וִו	Ex. 26:32, 37...	Hooks
מִכְבֵּר	Ex. 27:4.....	Grate
כֶּרֶב	Ex. 27:5.....	Compass
חִשְׁקִים	Ex. 27:10.....	Fillets
תִּשְׁבֵּץ	Ex. 28:4.....	Broidered
חֶשֶׁב	Ex. 28:8.....	Girdle
מִנְבֵּלָה	Ex. 28:14.....	Settings
מִלֵּאָה	Ex. 28:17.....	Ends
בִּרְקָת	Ex. 28:17.....	Carbuncle
שָׁבוּ	Ex. 28:19.....	An agate
לִישָׁם	Ex. 28:19.....	Ligure
אַחֲלָמָה	Ex. 28:19.....	Amethyst
נִבְלוֹת	Ex. 28:22.....	End
שְׂרָשָׁה	Ex. 28:22.....	Chains
חֶחַ	Ex. 28:28.....	Habergeon
תַּחֲרָא	Ex. 28:32.....	Loosed

NOTE K.—LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH—*Continued.*

HEBREW.	REFERENCE.	ENGLISH.
דכם	Ex. 28:28.	They shall bind
קעמון	Ex. 28:33.	Bells
שבץ	Ex. 28:39.	Embroider
מנבעות	Ex. 28:40.	Bonnets
אפד	Ex. 29:5.	Gird
תניף	Ex. 29:20.	Tip
כפרים	Ex. 29:36.	Atonement
יתרת	Ex. 29:13.	Caul
אליה	Ex. 29:22.	Rump
חזה	Ex. 29:26.	Breast
מקטר	Ex. 30:1.	Burn upon
יסך	Ex. 30:32.	Pour
חלבנה	Ex. 30:34.	Galbanum
שחלת	Ex. 30:34.	Onycha
רקח	Ex. 30:25.	Ointment
חרשת	Ex. 31:5.	Cutting
שרד	Ex. 31:10.	Service
חרת	Ex. 32:16.	Graven
חלושה	Ex. 32:18.	Overcome
שמצה	Ex. 32:25.	Shame
שכך	Ex. 33:22.	Will cover
מסוה	Ex. 34:33.	Vail
כומז	Ex. 35:22.	Tablets
טוה	Ex. 35:25.	Spin
מטוה	Ex. 35:25.	Spun
מראה	Lev. 1:6.	Crop
פזר	Lev. 1:8.	The fat
מלק	Lev. 1:15.	Wring off
קמץ	Lev. 2:2.	Shall take
פתת	Lev. 2:6.	Thou shalt part

NOTE K—LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH—*Continued*

HEBREW.	REFERENCE.	ENGLISH.
זָכָרָה	Lev. 2:2-16.	Memorial
נֶרֶשׁ	Lev. 2:14.	Beaten corn
מֵאֵפֶה	Lev. 2:4.	Baked
מִרְחֶשֶׁת	Lev. 2:7.	Frying pan
עֲצוֹה	Lev. 3:9.	Back bone
שָׁפָךְ	Lev. 4:12.	Are poured out
שְׂעִירָה	Lev. 4:28.	A kid
כֶּשֶׁבֶה	Lev. 5:6.	Lamb
תְּשׁוּמָה	Lev. 6:2.	Fellowship
אֲבֵדָה	Lev. 6:3.	Lost thing
מוֹקֵדָה	Lev. 6:9.	Burning
פָּרִם	Lev. 10:6.	Rend
נֶרֶה	Lev. 11:3.	The cud.
שִׁסְעַת	Lev. 11:3.	The cleft
אֲרֵנֶבֶת	Lev. 11:6.	Hare
סַנְפִּיר	Lev. 11:9.	Fins
פָּרִם	Lev. 11:13.	The ossifrage
עֹסְפִיָּה	Lev. 11:13.	Ospray
דֹּאָה	Lev. 11:14.	Vulture
שִׁחָף	Lev. 11:16.	Cuckoo
תַּחֲמָם	Lev. 11:16.	Night hawk
שֶׁלֶף	Lev. 11:17.	Cormorant
רָחִם	Lev. 11:18.	The gier eagle
תְּנִשְׁמָה	Lev. 11:18.	Swan
אֲנָפֶה	Lev. 11:19.	Heron
סַלְעִים	Lev. 11:22.	Bald Locust
דּוֹכִיפֶת	Lev. 11:19.	Lapwing
חֲרָגֵל	Lev. 11:22.	Beetle
חֹלֵד	Lev. 11:29.	Weasel
חֲמַט	Lev. 11:30.	Snail

NOTE K.—LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH—*Continued.*

HEBREW.	REFERENCE.	ENGLISH.
לטאה.....	Lev. 11:30.....	Lizard
כירים.....	Lev. 11:35.....	Ranges
ספחת.....	Lev. 13:2.....	Scab
בהרת.....	Lev. 13:2.....	Bright spot
מספחת.....	Lev. 13:6.....	Scab
פשה.....	Lev. 13:5-6.....	Spread
ישן.....	Lev. 13:11.....	Old
אדמדם...	Lev. 13:19.....	Reddish
מביה.....	Lev. 13:24.....	Burning
נתק.....	Lev. 13:30.....	A dry scale
צהב.....	Lev. 13:30.....	Yellow
בהק.....	Lev. 13:39.....	Freckled spot
נבחת.....	Lev. 13:42.....	Bald forehead
קרחת.....	Lev. 13:42.....	Bald head
פתחת...	Lev. 13:55.....	Fret inward
לה.....	Lev. 14:10.....	Log
שקערורות...	Lev. 14:37.....	Hollow strakes
זוב.....	Lev. 15:2.....	Issue
רזר.....	Lev. 15:3.....	Run; discharge
רקק.....	Lev. 15:8.....	Spit
רזה.....	Lev. 15:33.....	Sick
עזאזל.....	Lev. 16:8.....	Scapegoat
עתי.....	Lev. 16:21.....	Fit, or opportune
גרה.....	Lev. 16:22.....	Not inhabited
שארה.....	Lev. 18:17.....	Near kinswomen
שכבת.....	Lev. 18:20.....	Thy lying
תכל.....	Lev. 18:23.....	Confusion
רבע.....	Lev. 18:23.....	Lie down
לקט.....	Lev. 19:9.....	Gleanings
פרט.....	Lev. 19:10.....	Scattered

NOTE K—LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH—*Continued*

HEBREW.	REFERENCE.	ENGLISH.
כלאים	Lev. 19:19.....	Diverse kind
בקרת	Lev. 19:20.....	Scourging
חפשה	Lev. 19:20.....	Freedom
כתבת	Lev. 19:28.....	Insereption
קעקע	Lev. 19:28.....	Marks
שרטת	Lev. 21:5.....	Any cuttings
תבלל	Lev. 21:20.....	A blemish
מריח	Lev. 21:20.....	Broken
ילפת	Lev. 21:20.....	Scabbed
אשף	Lev. 21:20.....	Stones
גרב	Lev. 21:20.....	Scurvy
גבן	Lev. 21:20.....	Crookbackt
יבל	Lev. 22:22.....	Wen
עורת	Lev. 22:22.....	Blind
קלט	Lev. 22:23.....	Lacking in his parts
משחת	Lev. 22:25.....	Corruption
צמיתת	Lev. 25:23.....	Forever
מוך	Lev. 25:25-35...	Poor
ממכרת	Lev. 25:42.....	Sale
עקר	Lev. 25:47.....	Stock
דיש	Lev. 26:5.....	Thresh
קרהת	Lev. 26:16.....	Burning ague
שחפת	Lev. 26:16.....	Consumption
קרי	Lev. 26:21.....	Contrary
תקומה	Lev. 26:37.....	Power to stand
מרך	Lev. 26:36.....	Faintness
קריא	Num. 1:16.....	Renowned
פרוים	Num. 3:46.....	Redeemed
כסוי	Num. 4:6.....	Covering
צבה	Num. 5:27.....	Shall swell

NOTE K.—LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH—*Continued.*

HEBREW.	REFERENCE.	ENGLISH.
מִשְׁהָ	Num. 6:3.....	Liquor
הָרִצְנִים	Num. 6:4.....	Kernels
וֶן	Num. 6:4.....	Husk
פֶּטֶרָה	Num. 8:16.....	Such as open
אֶמְפִּיֶסֶף	Num. 11:4.....	Mixt multitude
שׁוּם	Num. 11:5.....	Garlic
אֶבְטָחִים	Num. 11:5.....	The melons
קִשְׁאִים	Num. 11:5.....	Cucumbers
בַּצֵּל	Num. 11:5.....	Onions
דּוֹךְ	Num. 11:8.....	Beat
מִדְבָּה	Num. 11:8.....	Mortar
נֶרָא	Num. 11:20.....	Loathsome
בַּחֲרִים	Num. 11:28.....	Young men
יֶרֶק	Num. 12:14.....	Spit
בְּרִיאָה	Num. 16:30.....	A new thing
רַקְעִים	Num. 16:38.....	Broad
חֶלֶף	Num. 18:21.....	For
אֶתְרִים	Num. 21:1.....	Spies
אֶרֶד	Num. 21:15.....	Stream
מִשְׁעוֹל	Num. 22:24.....	Path
קִבַּב	Num. 23:8.....	Hath cursed
נַחֲשׁ	Num. 23:23.....	Enchantment
שָׁתוּם	Num. 24:3-5.....	Are open
זָלִי	Num. 24:7.....	Buckets
אָבַד	Num. 24:10.....	Perish
יִרְשָׁה	Num. 24:18.....	Possession
קִבָּה	Num. 25:8.....	Belly
קִבֹּה	Num. 25:8.....	Tent
אָמַר	Num. 30:2.....	Bond
מִבְטָא	Num. 30:6.....	Uttered

NOTE K —LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH—*Continued*

HEBREW.	REFERENCE.	ENGLISH.
מסר	Num. 31:16.	Commit
מבם	Num. 31:28.	Tribute
מחצה	Num. 31:36.	Half
תרבית	Num. 32:14.	Increase
שך	Num. 33:55.	Pricks
צנינים	Num. 33:55.	And thorns
מחה	Num. 34:11.	Reach
תאֵה	Num. 34:7.	Point out
צדיה	Num. 35:20.	Laying of wait
מול	Deut. 1:1.	Over against
מדרך	Deut. 2:5.	Breadth
לֹא	Deut. 3:11.	Not
שגֵר	Deut. 7:13.	Increase
עֲשֵׂתוֹת	Deut. 7:13.	Flocks
מִדּוּה	Deut. 7:15.	Disease
מִסְכָּנָה	Deut. 8:9.	Scarceness
קִשִּׁי	Deut. 9:27.	Stubbornness
שִׁכְנָה	Deut. 12:5.	Habitation
מִסָּה	Deut. 16:10.	Tribute
אֵקָה	Deut. 14:5.	Wild goat
דִּישׁוֹן	Deut. 14:5.	Bison
וָמֵר	Deut. 14:5.	Chamois
תֹּאֵה	Deut. 14:5.	Wild ox
רֹאֵה	Deut. 14:13.	Glede
רַחֲמָה	Deut. 14:17.	Gier eagle
שִׁמְמָה	Deut. 15:1.	A release
מִשֵּׁה	Deut. 15:2.	Creditor
חֲרָמִישׁ	Deut. 16:9.	Sickle
קֶבֶה	Deut. 18:3.	The maw
שִׁנְיָא	Deut. 21:15.	Was hated

NOTE K.—LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH—*Continued.*

HEBREW.	REFERENCE	ENGLISH.
מעקה.....	Deut. 22:8.....	Battlement
שפכה.....	Deut. 23:1.....	Privy member
דכה.....	Deut. 23:1.....	Bruise
אֶזְנוֹ.....	Deut. 23:13.....	Weapon
קרה.....	Deut. 23:10.....	Uncleanness
מִלֵּיהֶם.....	Deut. 23:25.....	Ears of corn
עבֹד.....	Deut. 24:10.....	Pledge
דָּישׁ.....	Deut. 35:4.....	Tread
יָבֵם.....	Deut. 25:5.....	Husband's brother
מִבְּשֵׁים.....	Deut. 25:11.....	Secrets
חֶשֶׁל.....	Deut. 25:18.....	Feeble
טֵנָא.....	Deut. 26:2.....	Basket
סָכַר.....	Deut. 27:9.....	Take heed
מִנְעֵרַת.....	Deut. 28:20.....	Rebuke
דֹּלָקָה.....	Deut. 28:22.....	Inflammation
הִרְחִיר.....	Deut. 28:22.....	Burning
כָּלָה.....	Deut. 28:32.....	Fail
חָסַל.....	Deut. 28:38.....	Consume
רַךְ.....	Deut. 28:56.....	Tenderness
שְׁלִיָּה.....	Deut. 28:57.....	Young one
רָגַן.....	Deut. 28:65.....	Trembling
דָּאֵבֹן.....	Deut. 28:65.....	Sorrow
עָרַף.....	Deut. 32:2.....	Shall drop
שְׁעִירִים.....	Deut. 32:2.....	Small rain
פִּתְלָל.....	Deut. 32:5.....	Crooked
הִל.....	Deut. 32:6.....	Interrogative adverb
יָלַל.....	Deut. 32:10.....	Howling
חָפַף.....	Deut. 33:12.....	Cover
כִּשָּׁה.....	Deut. 32:15.....	Covered
שִׁיָּה.....	Deut. 32:18.....	Thou art unmindful

NOTE K—LIST OF HEBREW WORDS FOUND ONLY IN THE
HEXATEUCH—*Continued*

HEBREW.	REFERENCE.	ENGLISH.
מריר	Deut. 32:24	Bitter
רוש	Deut. 32:32	Gall.
דברות	Deut. 33:3	Words
חבב	Deut. 33:3	Loved
הבה	Deut. 33:3	Sat down
נרש	Deut. 33:14	Put forth
מוה	Deut. 32:24	Burnt
מנעל	Deut. 33:25	Shoes
כמם	Deut. 32:34	Laid up in store
שלם	Deut. 32:35	Recompense
סמרה	Deut. 32:38	Protection
קטורה	Deut. 33:10	Incense
שפן	Deut. 33:19	Treasures
שפע	Deut. 33:19	Abundance
זנק	Deut. 33:22	Leap
זבא	Deut. 33:25	Strength
לח	Deut. 34:7	Natural force
עבזר	Josh. 5:11	Old corn
זנב	Josh. 10:19	Hindmost
שרד	Josh. 10:20	Remained
מבולות	Josh. 16:9	Separate cities
נפת	Josh. 17:1	Countries
מועדה	Josh. 20:9	Appointed
מרד	Josh. 22:22	Rebellion
מאפל	Josh. 24:7	Darkness
אלה	Josh. 24:26	Oak

INDEX.

	PAGE		PAGE
ABBOTT, Lyman,	45	DRIVER, S. R.,	48
ALTARS,	57	52, 89, 96, 143, 277	
	156	ECCLESIASTES,	18
ANGLO-AMERICAN SCHOOL,	93	EGYPT,	128
	97		130
ARCHÆOLOGY,	113	EICHHORN, Johanan,	45
ART,	248	ETHICS,	219
ASTRUC, Jean,	45	EVOLUTION,	62
BACON, B. W.,	48	EWALD, H. A.,	47
	265	FABLE, A.,	180
BANCROFT, George,	304	FEELING, instead of facts,	153
BEAUTIFUL, The,	263		167, 267
BEECHER, H. W.,	301	GOOD, The,	255
BRIGGS, C. A.	88	GEDDES, A.,	47
	96, 210, 231	HALL, Dr. John,	320
CAVE, Alfred,	2	HARPER, W. R.,	213
	51		219, 307
CHEYNE, T. K.,	48	HEGEL,	238
	142, 270	HILKIAH,	68
CREATION, Accounts of,	125	HISTORY,	77
	158, 185, 195		120
CRITICISM, Lower,	6	" Evolved,	87
" Higher, Defined,	1		91, 94, 190
	45	HITTITES,	131
" " Good Work,	8	HOBBS,	44
" " Theories,	43		190
" " Data,	82	HOMMEL, Prof.,	114
CURTIS, E. L.	72	JERICO,	80
CURTIS, S. Ives,	259		134
DANIEL,	274	JESUS, Testimony of,	224
DELITSZCH, Franz,	47	JOB,	20
DEUTERONOMY,	55	JORDAN, D. S.,	149
DE WETTE, W. M. L.,	47	JUNIUS,	205
DIVINE NAMES,	131	KANT,	250

PAGE	PAGE
KUENEN, 48	SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH, . 131
177, 189, 244	SAYCE, Prof., 114
LANGAUGE, 181	121
" A demonstration, 197	278.
" Archaic words, . 201	282
MEAD, C. M., 213	315
METHODS, Unscholarly, . . 181	SCIENCE— 144
183, 189, 216, 254	Feared, 145
MILL, J. S., 149	Axioms, 147
173	Accuracy, 149
MIRACLES, Modern, 235	SCHRADER, Prof., 114
MOSES, 152	SMITH, H. P., 48
272, 322	SMITH, W. Robertson, 48
NAMES, 136	142, 250, 306
191	STYLE, 204
PSYCHOLOGY, 237	TEMPLE, 81
PROPHECY, 232	THEORIES, Numerous, . . . 220
PROPHETS, 231	311
Amos, 24; Daniel, 274; Eze-	TITHES, 58
kiel, 28; Isaiah, 25; the 2d	TOY, C. H., 48
Isaiah, 30; Habbakuk, 27;	TRUE, The, 250
Haggai, 37; Hosea, 24; Jer-	TUBINGEN SCHOOL, 238
emiah, 28; Joel, 23; Jonah,	VATKE, W., 48
24; Micah, 36; Malachi, 39;	VERNES, Maurice, 48
Nahum, 26; Obadiah, 23;	VOLTAIRE, 45
Zechariah, 37; Zephaniah, 26	WELLHAUSEN, Julius, 48
PSALMS—Classification, 14;	142, 190
Use, 13; Davidic author-	WILLET, H. L., 219
ship, 16 270	313
REASON, 4	WITNESSES, rejected, 86
RHEIM, 54	90
REUSS, 44	ZENOS, A. C., 51

ERRATA.

PAGE

- 15—Line 18 from bottom, for "Yorah" read Korah.
55—For "2817" read 28:17.
65—For "Hosea 4:12" read 8:12.
89—Line 5 from bottom, for "reviling" read rivaling.
122—Line 5 from top, for "alone" read along.
125—Line 17 from bottom to read "for".
127—Line 11 from bottom for "Delitz" read Delitzsch.
151—(Margin), for "Deposit" read Despot.
160—Line 12 from top, for "brake" read break.
176—Line 3 from top, for "parenthetic" read parenetic.
188—Line 18 from top, for "importation" read impartation.
192—Line 10 from top, after "are" insert proofs.
214—Line 11 from top, for "3:29" read 3:19.
243—Line 10 from bottom' for "Niebuhs" read Niebuhr.
256—Line 11 from top, for "despairingly" read disparagingly.
292—Line 8 from top, for "there velation" read the revelation.
294—Line 18 from bottom, for "48 A. D." read 48 B. C. and omit the next sentence.
36 (Appendix)—Line 4 from bottom, omit "כ".
Line 3 from bottom, for "כשר" read אשר.

١٠٠٠ ١٠٠ ١٠ ١

١٠٠٠ ١٠٠ ١٠ ١

١٠٠٠ ١٠٠ ١٠ ١

١٠٠٠ ١٠٠ ١٠ ١

١٠٠٠ ١٠٠ ١٠ ١

My private Counsel -

Consideration - seen - slow -
I guess said - "me"

2 The same made one - made one -

It all serves a purpose -

It is all economically administered

It is all governed and controlled -

I don't just understand all the de-
tail and minutia - but these are
of acts -

Bible -

It describes God as making all
these - governing and controlling

I see God in Creation

I hear him in Bible -

Hope

Christ says have numbered
persons made of nothing

How much more "me" as you
thing of insignificance of all.

So I believe and Hope -

Nothing here lost - Nothing lost
Here - after.

"Glory to God."

Destroying a legend - William Tell - Washington Hatschek etc 181-182	Others may be written to him Moses 18
Repetition proves nothing 188	History made to order
Higher Criticism - only mishap of infidels 190	Redactors 19
Names of God 193	Guessing at more certain
Illustrate Bapt-120 202	chapters 2
Jesus accomodating himself to people 225	Bible is God
Laver of Bophem 233	
Aulochus Sow - Shook 299	

BS476. S65

Smith, George T. (George Theodore), b.
Critique on higher criticism.

name

Page

See names "fossils" 140

not accurately - history 600 years after	Impossible	14
ones support Bible		14
representation of Science		14
side bound theology	145	14
deductive reasoning (definition of)		14
raphney		14
facts? mit		15
he - an emperor		15
misalignment		15
bishop only when God		15
see 2nd ch	185-186	16
	186	

BS
476
S65

S
P6
65
Smith, George T
Critique on higher criticism. Winfield,
Kan., Industrial Free Press, 1900.
323, 48p. 21cm.

1. Bible--Hermeneutics. I. Title.

CCSC/mmmb

